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MEETING: JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
DATE: December 15, 2005
TIME: 7:30 A.M.
PLACE: Council Chambers, Metro Regional Center

7:30 CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM
Rex Burkholder, Chair

7:30 INTRODUCTIONS
Rex Burkholder, Chair

7:35 CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

7:40 COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR
Rex Burkholder, Chair

7:45 CONSENT AGENDA
Consideration of JPACT minutes for October 13, 2005 and November 10, 2005
Rex Burkholder, Chair

DISCUSSION ITEMS

** Cost of Congestion debrief - INFORMATION
Jon Coney, Metro

* Direction of FY07 Appropriations Requests - DISCUSSION
Andy Cotugno, Metro

* RTP Update - INFORMATION
Kim Ellis, Metro

* Corridors Letter from Metro Council - DISCUSSION
Rex Burkholder, Chair
Robert Liberty, Metro

* Resolution 06-3651, FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE FY06 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP) - JPACT APPROVAL REQUESTED
Andy Cotugno, Metro

OTHER COMMITTEE BUSINESS
Rex Burkholder, Chair

9:00 ADJOURN
Rex Burkholder, Chair

* Material available electronically.
** Material to be emailed at a later date.
# Material provided at meeting.
All material will be available at the meeting.

Please call 503-797-1916 for a paper copy
MEMBERS PRESENT | AFFILIATION
---|---
Rex Burkholder, Chair | Metro Council
Rod Park, Vice Chair | Metro Council
Brian Newman | Metro Council
Maria Rojo de Steffey | Multnomah County
Bill Kennemer | Clackamas County
Roy Rogers | Washington County
Matthew Garrett | Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)
Dick Pedersen | Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Fred Hansen | TriMet
Charlotte Lehan | Non-voting representative, Cities of Clackamas County

MEMBERS ABSENT | AFFILIATION
---|---
Sam Adams | City of Portland
Rob Drake | City of Beaverton, representing Cities of Washington County
Lynn Peterson | City of Lake Oswego, representing Cities of Clackamas County
Steve Stuart | Clark County
Paul Thalhofer | City of Troutdale, representing Cities of Multnomah County
Royce Pollard | City of Vancouver
Don Wagner | Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Bill Wyatt | Port of Portland

ALTERNATES PRESENT | AFFILIATION
---|---
Susie Lahsene | Port of Portland
Dean Lookingbill | Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Jason Tell | Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT - Region 1)

GUESTS PRESENT | AFFILIATION
---|---
Stuart Anderson | UrbanTrans Consultants
Edward Barnes | WSDOT
William Barnes | Citizen
Scott Bricker | Citizen, BTA
Kathy Busse | Washington County
Olivia Clark | TriMet
Rob DeGraff | Columbia River Crossing
I. CALL TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME OF NEW MEMBERS

Chair Rex Burkholder called the meeting to order at 7:38 a.m. Because there was not a quorum, Chair Burkholder requested that the committee proceed with the informational items and address the consent agenda when a quorum is reached.

Chair Burkholder announced that Ms. Charlotte Lehan, Mayor of the City of Wilsonville would be representing Clackamas County for the meeting.

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

RTO UPDATE AND RIDESHARE RECOMMENDATIONS

Ms. Pam Peck appeared before the committee to present an RTO update and rideshare recommendations. She directed the committee's attention to the RTO program fact sheet (included as part of this meeting record) and briefly reviewed the programs' background and priorities. She noted that a collaborative marketing program with ODOT and partner agencies from across Oregon is currently under development.

Mr. Stuart Anderson and Mr. John Resha, consultants with UrbanTrans, presented the market research and implementation plan for the rideshare program (included as part of this meeting record). They provided an overview of the plan, market analysis and report findings. In summary, they recommended the creation of a Regional Commuter Services Program, which
would feature a formal rideshare program administered by Metro and staff so it could be organized under the umbrella of a one-stop-shop for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) information.

Mr. Garrett noted his appreciation for the direction of the program and that it is complementary to current transit alternatives through active promotion of support services and would avoid creating competing alternatives and services.

III. DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Burkholder declared a quorum at 8:05am

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

Minutes

Mr. Matt Garrett requested that his comments in the previous meeting minutes regarding the work program for corridor refinement planning through 2020 be amended (see below) to better reflect the breadth of the conversation.

Mr. Matt Garrett stated that he supports the program and direction, but feels that this conversation is occurring prematurely. He prefers to wait until the I-205 South corridor reconnaissance is complete and incorporates results from the STIP outreach and RTP update.

MOTION: Mr. Fred Hansen moved to approve the September 15th meeting minutes as amended. Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

V. ACTION ITEMS

RESOLUTION NO. 05-3616, FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPDATING THE WORK PROGRAM FOR CORRIDOR REFINEMENT PLANNING THROUGH 2020

Ms. Bridget Wieghart appeared before the committee to present Resolution 05-3616, which would update the work program for corridor refinement planning through 2020. The resolution was presented at the September 15th meeting, but the committee decided not to take action until the timing issues brought up by Mr. Matt Garrett and Ms. Lynn Peterson’s connectivity concerns were resolved.

Ms. Wieghart presented an amended version of the resolution (included as part of this meeting record). Ms. Leyhan distributed a handout (included as part of this meeting record), which contained two additional resolves for discussion that would address Ms. Lynn Peterson’s connectivity concerns.

MOTION: Mr. Brian Newman moved to approve Resolution 05-3616 as presented. Mr. Matt Garrett seconded the motion.

MOTION TO AMEND MAIN MOTION: Mr. Bill Kennemer moved, seconded by Mr. Newman, to amend Resolution 05-3616 to include the first resolve submitted in writing by Ms. Lynn Peterson, which states:
The recommendations of the Highway 217, I-205 and I-5/99W Connector Corridor Studies shall be reassessed in light of the findings of the Outer Southwest Area Corridor Study.

Mr. Roy Rogers questioned the meaning of the word "reassessed" in the resolve, noting the importance of keeping projects moving forward, and not going back to square one. The committee discussed the intent of the language.

Mr. Fred Hansen proposed a friendly amendment to change the word "reassessed" to "reevaluated" "evaluated".

VOTE ON MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED: Chair Burkholder moved to amend the main motion, by adding the resolve and replacing the word "reassessed" with "evaluated". The motion passed.

Mr. Hansen reiterated that the planning process is some of the most important work done at JPACT, yet very little time is spent on planning as compared to debates on individual projects.

Chair Burkholder suggested that meeting in smaller committees to discuss details might allow time for the big picture planning conversations at regular JPACT meetings.

VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS

STIP Update/Funding Levels

Mr. Jason Tell appeared before the committee to provide an update on the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). He noted that staff recommends restoring MOD funding. Generally the trend shows a slight increase in programs, except the bridge program, which takes a hit in 2010 and 2011 due to OTIA. He stated that there is still uncertainty on how SAFTEA-LU will be distributed.

Congresswoman Darlene Hooley

Chair Burkholder welcomed Congresswoman Darlene Hooley to JPACT and each member briefly introduce themselves.

Congresswoman Hooley commented on the importance of patience, as demonstrated by lightrail extending to Clackamas County.

She stated that Portland is a model for other metropolitan areas and that because Metro and JPACT have consistently stuck to their commitments, it is an organization that has earned the trust of many.

The committee and Congresswoman Hooley discussed a recent tolling article in the Oregonian. Mr. Tell clarified that the article did not make the distinction between the I-205 auxiliary project and tolling on the entire I-205 facility. Mr. Garrett noted that tolling, which is only in the discussion phase and other innovative financing options are being explored.

The committee and Congresswoman Hooley discussed the potential plans for a major retailer in the Sellwood area and how that would affect the possibility of lightrail to the area. Mr. Hansen noted that a major development at the site would have a harmful effect on future lightrail at the site in question.
VII. OTHER COMMITTEE BUSINESS

There was none.

VIII. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Rex Burkholder adjourned the meeting at 9:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Martin
Recording Secretary
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I. CALL TO ORDER, INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME OF NEW MEMBERS

Chair Rex Burkholder declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

II. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Chris Smith, 2343 NW Pettygrove St, member of TPAC and NW Portland neighborhood representative, appeared before the committee and announced the recent rezoning on Vaughn street.

Ms. Sharon Nasset, 4772 N. Lombard, appeared before the committee and briefly stated the importance of sound transportation infrastructure.

III. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

Chair Burkholder announced that the November 17th JPACT Finance committee would be cancelled in lieu of the special JPACT meeting on December 1st.

Chair Burkholder noted that he is looking into the possibility of organizing a JPACT retreat so the committee could finalize appropriations and prepare for the DC trip as well as discuss the design status for the regional transportation plan update.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

Minutes

ACTION TAKEN: Chair Burkholder called for approval of the October 13th meeting minutes. Hearing no objections, the motion passed.

With regards to the section of the minutes showing the motion made on Resolution 05-3616, Mr. Roy Rogers commented that the minutes show the committee approved replacing the word
"reassessed" with "reevaluated", which was different than his recollection of what happened at the meeting which was changing the word "reassessed" to "evaluated". Considerable discussion ensued regarding the meaning of the words "evaluated" and "reevaluated".

Chair Burkholder stated that the final version of the resolution approved by the Metro Council and previous meeting tape would be reviewed to determine whether an error had been made in the minutes and reported at the next regular JPACT meeting.

ACTION TAKEN: Mr. Brian Newman moved to unapproved the minutes, seconded by Ms. Lynn Peterson. The motion passed.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

STIP Schedule / ODOT Program Funding Targets

Mr. Matt Garrett appeared before the committee to report on the STIP Schedule / ODOT Program Funding Targets. He directed the committee's attention to a draft 2008-2011 STIP Development Timeline for JPACT and ODOT (included as part of this meeting record) and reviewed several upcoming dates on the timeline including:

- **January 2006** – Region 1 will distribute the Candidate Project List and funding allocations to agency stakeholders and the public for comment.
- **March 2006** – JPACT will adopt comments on the Candidate Project List and submit to ODOT.
- **April 2006** – April 14th deadline for comments on the Candidate Project List.

Mr. Ted Leybold noted that at their October 19th meeting, the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) received the ODOT staff recommendation on funding levels for each program area to be the basis for development of the 2008-2011 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The STIP will reflect the increased funding levels provided by the SAFTEA-LU reauthorization bill, including increased funding from 2005 forward. The OTC is seeking comments and will take action on the funding targets at their meeting in December.

Mr. Leybold directed the committee's attention to a draft comment letter (included as part of this meeting record). The committee briefly discussed each suggested comment. The committee also discussed the additional issues, as listed on page 3 of the document, raised by TPAC.

**MOTION:** Ms. Susie Lahsene moved to approve the letter. Mr. Roy Rogers seconded the motion.

The committee discussed adding several of the additional issues (listed on page 3 of the document) to the letter.

**MOTION TO AMEND MAIN MOTION:** Mr. Matt Garrett moved to include issues #2, 3 and 4 in the letter.

**VOTE ON MOTION TO AMEND:** Chair Burkholder called for a vote to add issue #2 to the letter. With seven members voting in favor and seven members opposing, Chair Burkholder cast the final vote in opposition. The motion failed.
VOTE ON MOTION TO AMEND #2: Chair Burkholder called for a vote to add issue #3 to the letter. With nine members voting in favor, four opposing and one abstaining, the motion passed.

VOTE ON MAIN MOTION TO AMEND #3: Chair Burkholder called for a vote to add issue #4 to the letter. With four members voting in favor, nine opposed and one abstaining, the motion failed.

VOTE ON MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED: The vote was 13/1 in favor. The motion passed.

FY 07 Appropriations requests

Mr. Andy Cotugno appeared before the committee to discuss the FY'07 Appropriations requests. Staff is seeking policy guidance from JPACT on what to emphasize in this region's FY '07 Transportation Appropriations requests. He directed the committee's attention to a memo (included as part of this meeting record), which provided the committee with several alternative approaches to develop the region's priority earmark request. The committee briefly reviewed the issues listed. Mr. Brian Newman noted his immediate preference for option #1, but asked how the committee should go about evaluating the options. Mr. Cotugno responded that projects with a direct relationship to permanent jobs should be emphasized.

Mr. Rogers noted that the Washington D.C. trip would be more effective if the committee would go in early February, rather than in early March, bring a smaller delegation and frame their message.

ConnectOregon Letter

Chair Burkholder directed the committee's attention to a draft comment letter to ODOT regarding the propose ConnectOregon program rules. The letter states JPACT support for the program overall, but lists several issues that should be further addressed in either the rules or application information.

New Look / RTP Update

Mr. Tom Kloster appeared before the committee to present information on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update. The Metro Council initiated an update to the RTP that will be closely coordinated with the 2040 New Look and culminate with the new 2035 RTP in December 2007. The update will address regional, state and federal planning requirements and incorporate new policy direction stemming from the 2040 New Look. The update will occur in phases, as dictated by varying state and federal planning requirements. It will also incorporate a new approach to developing the federal financial constrained system using the "budgeting for outcomes" process.

Corridors Letter

Due to time constraints, Chair Burkholder stated that the corridors letter would be discussed at the next regular JPACT meeting on December 15, 2005.

VII. OTHER COMMITTEE BUSINESS

There was none.
VIII. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Rex Burkholder adjourned the meeting at 9:03 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Martin
Recording Secretary
Cash is roadblock for road upgrades

Costs of congestion are well-known, but fixes go unfunded

By JIM REDDEN  Issue date: Fri, Dec 9, 2005

Although traffic congestion is hurting businesses throughout the Portland area, transportation officials say they have no money to begin building the new roads or additional lanes that could speed shipments and deliveries.

Approximately $630 million is spent on transportation projects and operations in the metropolitan region every year, split almost evenly between road and mass transit projects.

But, according to officials, the road money is not even enough to pay all maintenance needs, and most of the transit money cannot simply be shifted to roads because of transportation funding policies.

"We have to be realistic and admit we’re not going to be able to substantially increase our transportation budgets. The voters are not willing to pay more money for more construction projects," said Rex Burkholder, a member of the Metro Council, the regional government charged with setting transportation funding priorities in most of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties.

Burkholder chairs a committee that is preparing to update Metro’s Regional Transportation Plan, a document approved by the council that sets spending priorities for the next 20 years. The review is expected to result in the council’s approving a revised plan by December 2007.

"The list is already much larger than we can afford," Burkholder said.

A recent report found that congestion is a real and growing problem throughout the metropolitan region. It identified 18 transportation bottlenecks in the three counties that are hurting the economy.

"Congested corridors are everywhere. Not just in Portland, not just downtown, but everywhere — which means that it affects businesses and residents everywhere," said Glen Weisbrod, president of the Boston-based Economic Development Research Group, which conducted the study, titled "The Cost of Congestion to the Economy of the Portland Region."

According to Weisbrod, the problems will worsen as more people move to the region. Metro, the regional government charged with managing growth, predicts that around 1 million more people will settle in the Portland area by 2025.

"Congestion-related problems can be expected to worsen exponentially. The more vehicles you put on the road, the greater the problems that are caused by accidents and other delays," he said.

Despite the consequences, a draft Oregon Transportation Plan released...
late last month predicted state spending will not keep up with population increases that are already straining the road system. Oregon voters have repeatedly defeated ballot measures to raise the state's 24-cent-per-gallon gas tax, the primary transportation funding source.

"About $1.3 billion more in revenue per year is needed to maintain and expand the publicly owned components of the state, regional and local transportation system," said the draft report, which will be finalized next year.

The report said that up to $8.1 million a year in state funds can be shifted from transit to road projects — a small fraction of the current road needs.

The Portland Office of Transportation is already facing a $5.5 million shortfall in next year's budget. The deficit is projected to grow to $11 million in the following five years because of an anticipated reduction in state gasoline tax money.

The office will sponsor a public forum to discuss the potential shortfalls from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. Tuesday in the Plaza Conference Room of the World Trade Center, 121 S.W. Salmon St.

According to Burkholder, transportation leaders need to consider such ideas as charging tolls for driving during rush hours, which would discourage unnecessary vehicle trips at peak travel times.

"The world has changed, and we need to be creative," he said.

A big list of problems

The congestion study was funded by local governments and businesses on behalf of the Portland Business Alliance, Metro, the Port of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation. It grew out of a Transportation Investment Task Force appointed by former Metro Executive Mike Burton in 2002.

The study group that commissioned it was co-chaired by Jay Waldron, a Portland attorney who serves as president of the Port of Portland Commission, and Steve Clark, president of the Portland Tribune and Community Newspapers Inc.

As part of the study, Weisbrod's group identified 18 routes or intersections of significant congestion scattered throughout the region. Some of them were identified through interviews with executives at 16 area businesses that rely on deliveries or shipping. Others were named by Metro.

The areas included such lengthy transportation corridors as Interstate 5 north through Portland, all of Interstate 205, Southwest Scholls Ferry Road and St. Helens Road from Portland past the St. Johns Bridge. The executives and Metro also identified such specific intersections as Southeast Powell Boulevard and Foster Road, Southeast Sunnyvale Road and Oregon Highway 212, and Southeast 282nd Avenue and Troutdale Road.

Weisbrod said the congested routes and intersections were especially significant for businesses that depend on traffic moving through them.

"The economic consequences are dramatic and substantial," he said.

Cash has strings attached

Finding solutions is complicated because transportation improvement projects are funded and administered by different governmental entities. For example, most of the federal money used for regional light-rail construction is only available for transit projects. If TriMet did not use...
the money, it would go to a transit agency in another city.

"There are a lot of layers to the decision-making because there are different sources of money, and most of them have restrictions about how they can be used," Burkholder said.

Transit is also a consideration because of state and regional land-use policies that call for transportation projects to support high-density, mixed-use developments. This priority is set forth in the goals enforced by the state Land Conservation and Development Commission and Metro 2040 Growth Concept, which is intended to govern regional growth for the next 35 years.

This emphasis is clearly stated in the Oregon Transportation Plan that will be finalized next year. One of the policies said: "It is the policy of the State of Oregon to increase access to goods and services and promote health by encouraging development of compact communities and neighborhoods that integrate residential, commercial and employment land uses to help make shorter trips, transit, walking and bicycling feasible."

This goal is repeated in much of the literature produced by Metro, including an explanatory brochure titled "Funding regional transportation priorities," which says, "The 2040 Growth Concept defines the region's policy for encouraging development in existing industrial areas and centers. Centers are higher density centers of employment and housing that are well served by transit to form compact areas or retail, cultural and recreational activities in a walkable environment. By directing development to these areas, the impact on existing neighborhoods and on surrounding farm and forest land is minimized."

Traffic mounts all over

The Portland area is not the only metropolitan region in North America struggling with congestion. Far from it. According to Weisbrod, at least eight other regions in this country and Canada have recently completed studies on the economic impact of congestion. They include Atlanta; Chicago; Los Angeles; Milwaukee, Wis.; Toronto; Vancouver, British Columbia; the Everett-Seattle-Tacoma area; and the Houston-Dallas-San Antonio-Austin, Texas, area.

The local study did not propose specific solutions for Portland's problems. Waldron said the goal was to define the area's problems and call attention to their social and economic costs. Some of the studies in the other cities included detailed proposals for new or expanded freeways and rail systems, developing or designating truck routes and the use of high-tech traffic management systems.

Financing these projects is a challenge for all of the areas, Weisbrod said. As a result, the other studies proposed a variety of funding options, including tolls that are increased during peak driving hours to discourage discretionary trips.

"Examples from around North America also illustrate the range of policies and programs that can be adopted to minimize future congestion. They include capital investments to increase the capacity of highway and transit systems, transportation system management and prioritization strategies to enhance the efficiency of existing facilities, and pricing schemes that shift demand so that traffic most needing a facility can still move efficiently while other traffic is shifted to alternative times, facilities or services," the report said.

Burkholder agreed.
“All of these ideas need to be part of the mix,” he said.
The congestion study is online at www.metro-region.org/article.cfm?
articleid=16673.

Email Jim Redden
Trucks and cars inch over the Interstate 5 bridge during rush hour. A recent report predicts that area residents will need to spend an additional 50 hours in traffic per year by 2025 as congestion increases. Gridlock also cuts into company profits.

**Road to ruin?**

For businesses and commuters, traffic jams carry costs beyond frustration.

Most Portlanders affected by the area's growing congestion complain about longer commute times and shopping trips and more money spent on gas.

But to many area companies, congestion not only means delivery delays and higher gas costs — it also can mean missed connections and lost business opportunities.

Unless action is taken to improve the region's transportation system, all of these problems are expected to substantially worsen over the next 20 years, according to a report released this week titled "The Cost of Congestion to the Economy of the Portland Region."

The report — prepared by the Economic Development Research Group of Boston — says increased congestion will force members of each area household to be on the road an additional 50 hours a year by 2025. The congestion also will cost the local economy $844 million a year by then, including lost worker productivity, higher transportation costs and lost business earnings, it says.

"The stakes are high for the economy and quality of life in the Portland metropolitan region, representing thousands of jobs and billions of dollars," warns the report, which was funded by local governments and businesses on behalf of the Portland Business Alliance, Metro, the Port of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation.

According to the report, much of the additional congestion will be a result of people moving to the Portland area in the next two decades.
More than 1 million more people are expected to settle here by 2025, according to the most recent population projections produced by Metro, the regional government charged with managing growth in most of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties.

The report says the additional residents are expected to boost the number of cars on local roads by more than 40 percent by 2025.

"Obviously, the number of people moving to the Portland area is going to increase the number of cars on the road," says Glen Weisbrod, president of the Economic Development Research Group.

But, Weisbrod says, truck traffic will increase even more — almost 120 percent by 2025 — largely as a result of ongoing changes in the global economy. Portland is a major transportation hub, the junction of several important highways, rail lines, a port and an airport. Economic trends such as outsourcing and Internet shopping are increasing the amount of goods that move through the transportation systems.

"Congestion reduces the advantages of location," Weisbrod says.

Metro has adopted a regional transportation plan that calls for spending approximately $4 billion on system improvements over the next 20 years. The report found that congestion would increase even with the upgrades. Unless the region substantially increases its spending on transportation improvements, the report predicts regional households and businesses will lose an additional 212,000 hours a day in traffic delays.

The lost time could be cut to 94,000 hours a day if an additional $6.2 billion were spent on traffic improvements over the next 20 years, the report predicts.

One business that already is feeling the pinch is OrePac Building Products, a residential building supply company that serves the Portland area out of a Wilsonville distribution center. According to OrePac Chief Financial Officer Alan Kirk, the company has been forced to buy two new trucks in recent years to maintain its daily delivery schedule.

"It used to be our trucks could make six to 10 deliveries a day in the Portland area. But over the past three years, that dropped to only five to eight deliveries a day because of increased congestion. The only way to keep our customers stocked was to buy two more trucks and hire two more drivers," Kirk says.

The cost to the company? Approximately $220,000 year, counting the vehicles, drivers, insurance and fuel.

As city grows, so does traffic

The Economic Development Research Group report grew out of a regional Transportation Funding Task Force that was first appointed by former Metro Executive Director Mike Burton in 2002. It is co-chaired by Jay Waldron, a Portland attorney who serves as president of the Port of Portland Commission, and Steve Clark, president of the Portland Tribune and Community Newspapers Inc.

According to Waldron, the report is the first formal attempt to determine how much the local economy depends on transportation.

"We were asked to look at regional transportation needs, and we looked out the window and saw the congestion," Waldron says.

The study and report were funded by a coalition of local governments and many local businesses. It was coordinated by the Portland Business Alliance, which represents many central city business owners.

"We all know intuitively that we have a congestion problem, but nobody has stopped to figure out what the cost is," says Sandra.
McDonough, the alliance's president and chief executive officer.

The report found that compared with similar-size cities in the country, Portland's "competitiveness is largely dependent on the region's role as a gateway and distribution center for domestic inland and international markets." It also documented that congestion already is hurting the competitiveness of both large and small local businesses. Many of them have made schedule changes to avoid afternoon rush-hour traffic. Others have been forced to do even more.

According to the report, these companies that do business in the Portland area also are paying for the increased congestion:

• Intel Corp. has moved its last shipping departure time up two hours for outbound shipments through Portland International Airport. A missed flight affects production across the globe and can result in costly operational changes.

• SYSCO Food Services, a national food distribution company with a Wilsonville distribution center, was forced to open a new distribution center in Spokane, Wash., because trips through Portland were taking too long.

• PGE estimates it is spending an additional $500,000 a year for additional travel time for its maintenance crews.

Portland already is ranked the 20th most congested city in the country out of 85, according to the 2005 Mobility Study conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute, based at Texas A&M University. The study says annual traffic delays per traveler grew from seven hours in 1982 to 38 hours in 2003, the most recent year for which figures were available.

The report predicts that costs for many businesses will continue to increase — and some business may leave the area — unless congestion can be reduced.

"As congestion continues to worsen, businesses in this region will be at a competitive disadvantage. Businesses that serve local needs either absorb the added costs and reduce their profits, or pass these costs on to the region’s consumers through higher prices. Trade-oriented businesses, however, can respond by moving their operations, and the jobs they provide, to locations outside the region," the report says.

According to the Economic Development Research Group's report, every $1 invested in improving the transportation system will produce more than $2 in benefits.

The report does not recommend a specific package or budget for transportation improvements. Instead, it is intended to call attention to a growing problem and inspire discussions about it.

"This is the first step," Waldron says. "We’ve identified the effects of congestion on the economy. Now we need to show the business community what this means to them, then talk to the community about what it means for everyone’s future."

More money would help

The research group's report was released just a few days after the release of a draft Oregon Transportation Plan that confirms congestion is a growing problem — especially in the Portland area.

"The most congested state highway corridors, primarily those in the Portland metropolitan area, face peak traffic demands with slower travel speeds and longer travel times. On average, in 2002 urban freeways carried almost double the amount of traffic they carried in 1982," the report says.

The draft state transportation report agrees with the research group's
report that congestion is threatening the economy.

“Our economy relies on efficient, safe and secure transportation services,” it says. “Customers depend on flexible, reliable and just-in-time freight movements. But congestion is growing on highways.”

The report warns that the state does not have enough dedicated transportation dollars to maintain its existing roads, let alone improve them or add new ones. It says the state needs to raise an additional $276 million a year for its road system, just to keep pace with inflation.

As a result, unless additional transportation dollars are found, Oregon roads will continue to deteriorate and congestion will increase for the foreseeable future.

“As congestion increases, travel speeds become variable, and traffic accidents and other incidents can easily disrupt the traffic flow. Travel time becomes more unreliable, and the amount of delay increases. This delay and unreliability increases travel costs for people, services and goods, and decreases businesses’ competitive advantage,” the report says.

The draft report is the first step toward updating the Oregon Transportation Plan, the state’s long-range strategy for all forms of transportation, including highways, railways, airports, bicycle paths and pipelines. It provides a framework for prioritizing transportation improvements and developing funding for them. The last plan — the state’s first — was adopted 25 years ago. The new plan will set state transportation spending priorities for the next quarter-century.

Over the next few months, the draft plan will be reviewed by local and regional transportation organizations, including Metro’s Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee, which was scheduled to hear a presentation on it today.

When the report is finalized, it will be submitted to the Oregon Transportation Commission for approval. The commission oversees the Oregon Department of Transportation.

Metro also is preparing to review its Regional Transportation Plan, as required by state and federal law. According to Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder, the review will begin next year and hopefully will produce a list of regional projects requiring state funding to be presented to the 2007 Oregon Legislature.

“By then we should have a list of projects that everyone agrees on, and we can have a discussion about funding options,” said Burkholder, who chairs Metro’s Joint Regional Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation.

*Email Jim Redden*
A report released today does a good job of describing the impact of congestion in the Portland region: It's a drain on every household and puts thousands of jobs and the region's economy at risk.

Within 20 years and without adequate investments in transportation, congestion will cost the region $844 million in annual losses including 6,500 jobs. The report also tells us that congestion would cost each household $782 annually, or 50 additional hours stuck in traffic.

In addition to these quantifiable expenses, congestion will exact another toll: If it is not addressed, Portland will fall behind other cities in the nation as more employees, products and customers are ensnared in traffic each year. A Boston research firm prepared the cost-of-congestion study on behalf of the Portland Business Alliance, Metro, the Port of Portland and the Oregon Department of Transportation. A mix of area businesses and local governments funded the effort.

The report accomplishes what many private and public leaders have failed for years to make clear: that an effective regional transportation system should be important to everyone.

The real question, however, is not what the report says. It's whether anyone will be listening when the sponsors of the study begin telling elected officials, business leaders and the general public that congestion is not only frustrating, but a growing threat to economic and personal well-being.

Also left unanswered is whether local, regional, state and federal decision-makers will require transportation projects to pass a litmus test of how they might improve the regional economy, or how they might remove local households from the noose of costly congestion.

For years, that hasn't been the case. Transportation investments remain poorly funded. And often, they are decided by regional roulette. Limited dollars are distributed from community to community, or project to project, with insufficient attention paid to measurable outcomes such as economic impact.

It's time to do better.

Business, community and public agency leaders should help shape...
Current weather

public opinion to require that the region reduce congestion before it becomes even more expensive for each Portland-area household and the regional economy.
Poking along in heavy traffic

Fixing congestion requires us all to look beyond the commute

Monday, December 05, 2005

It goes without saying — though not necessarily without cursing — that Oregon's population growth has resulted in traffic slowdowns from Clark County to the California border.

Beyond the obvious connection between growth and congestion are some more disquieting matters. For example, truck traffic in Oregon is growing at a much faster rate than auto traffic, especially in the Portland region, where the state's largest airport and seaport have contributed to the growth of a thriving warehouse-and-distribution sector south of the city.

These trends in traffic growth are on a course to collide with the Legislature's traditional view of transportation as a purely local concern.

If one thing has become obvious to residents of the Portland area, it's that intelligent transportation improvements provide benefits that extend far beyond an immediate neighborhood. From Vancouver to Wilsonville, planners, businesspeople and elected officials have shown an encouraging ability to recognize the broad value of transportation investments, whether that meant building interchanges by the airport or sending buses from one suburb to another.

(Not that the necessary improvements are restricted to roads and highways. Rail lines, waterways, access to air traffic — even the proposed tram — all are part of the equation.)

Now it's time for the state's legislators from Ontario to Newport and from Ashland to Hood River to adopt similarly broad attitudes. It's increasingly obvious that an investment that improves traffic flow in, say, Parkrose, may make it easier for an eastern Oregon farmer to send his wheat to Asia.

This is obvious to anybody who bothers to review the state's new Transportation Plan, to scan the latest collaboratively financed congestion study or talk to a businessperson who stocks or ships tangible goods. Traffic congestion has real costs, in the form of labor, inventory and, of course, fuel. A transportation system that bogs down under the weight of overuse is one that can cost cities good jobs as businesses put their employees elsewhere.

It's always tempting to legislate to the narrowest constituency; re-election is easier when the highest priority is keeping potholes filled in the home district. But farmers and small-business operators are smart people who understand that they are linked to a commercial world far beyond their own municipal boundaries. They know that bottlenecks are costly, whether they occur on
Poking along in heavy traffic

Main Street or Terminal 6.

The same is true of political bottlenecks, whether they occur in Portland, Salem or Washington, D.C. What we all want is simply a system that works.

MORE EDITORIALS

• A civil liberties wrangle averted. Or not.
• A flawed Oregon system
• Police Bureau needs a new compass
• More Editorials

© 2005 The Oregonian. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.
Traffic dents bottom line, study shows

Congestion - The Portland area would save $2 for every $1 spent on easing delays

Friday, December 02, 2005

JAMES MAYER

FACTBOX

- Costs of traffic
- Costs of traffic

Major investments over the next 20 years to ease traffic jams in the Portland area could save $2 for every $1 spent, according to a new study of the economic costs of congestion.

The study, commissioned by the Port of Portland, Metro and the Portland Business Alliance, found that congested roads are hurting the region's economy, and could get much worse.

"We are so trade dependent, congestion dramatically affects Portland, more so than almost any other city in the United States," said Jay Waldron, president of the Port commission.

Waldron said the study has its roots in the work of a 2002 transportation investment task force whose recommendations failed to gain traction. "The business community wanted to see some numbers," he said. "They wanted to understand exactly how congestion affects the economy."
The study, which doesn't deal with particular projects, or how to pay for them, calculated that spending $10.2 billion over the next 20 years — about $6.2 billion more than already planned — would save Portland area businesses and citizens $844 million a year by 2025.

Glen Weisbrod, president of the consulting firm Economic Development Research Group, based in Boston, said congestion threatens Portland's competitiveness as a major gateway and distribution center for domestic and international markets. Industries such as high tech, wood products, metals, tourism and wholesale distribution depend on good transportation.

Traffic is expected to increase 120 percent over the next 20 years, compared with about 45 percent for car traffic. The growth of Internet sales also has led to more trucks on the road, Weisbrod said.

And although mass transit is important for a balanced transportation system, many businesses have no choice but to use the roads. UPS can't deliver packages on the bus, he said. These businesses become "prisoners of congestion," Weisbrod said.

"There's no escape. You can't even take a short cut."

The study cited several examples of this problem, based on interviews with local businesses. Intel, which ships about 1,100 orders each week, has missed deliveries, affecting production lines around the world. PGE spends about $500,000 a year on additional travel for maintenance crews. OrePac Building Products, which relies on just-in-time delivery, has had to increase its inventory to make up for delays.

And the time that workers waste commuting affects schedule options, and makes recruitment more difficult and expensive.

Congestion also shrinks markets. Weisbrod cited the example of a pizza restaurant that finds the area to which it can deliver hot pizzas become smaller because of the extra time it takes to get around town.

He stressed that congestion is not going to go away. It's a question of slowing increases in traffic. Spending $4 billion on improvements as planned by Metro would still result in 212,000 hours of additional delay each day by 2025.

But boosting spending to $10.2 billion would reduce that figure by about 118,000 hours a day.

The estimated $844 million a year in savings is a combination of additional business income generated by the economy and the value of time saved by individuals on personal trips.

Waldron said the next step for the study's sponsors will be to share the results with the business community. And then to "take it to voters and the political community to get the conversation going" on what action to take.

James Mayer: 503-294-4109; jimmayer@news.oregonian.com
Businesses, Metro address cost of traffic congestion
by Libby Tucker
12/05/2005

Failure to relieve traffic congestion in the Portland region's transportation system will cost the region 6,500 jobs and $844 million by 2025, says a new study by the Economic Development Research Group, a Boston-based consulting firm. A lack of capital improvement projects could also cost the region 2,000 to 3,000 construction jobs annually.

The study, sponsored by the Portland Business Alliance, the Port of Portland, Metro and the Oregon Department of Transportation, does not make planning or funding recommendations. Instead, it sets a framework for Metro's upcoming regional transportation plan, which will prioritize capital improvement projects for funding. Work on the new plan begins in 2006, with a final document due in 2008.

"There is a looming (transportation) problem, and in some ways it might be a crisis," said Metro councilor Rex Burkholder at the Dec. 1 council meeting where the new study was presented. "But in terms of how we respond, that is something we will be deciding over the next year and a half working with the public on our regional transportation plan."

The study analyzed transportation system demand and capacity and local business costs, operations and growth strategies to determine the "cost of congestion" to the Portland metropolitan region over the next 20 years.

The region's current $4 billion, 20-year capital improvement investment plan was compared to an idealistic, $10 billion plan that would incorporate all the projects on the region's long wish list. The analysis showed that additional strategic investments could return $2 for every additional dollar spent.

"You can't build your way out of congestion, but you can certainly help," said Glen Weisbrod, president of the Economic Development Research Group and a national expert on traffic congestion. Maintaining the current $200 million a year level of funding could spell disaster for the region's ability to compete in the global economy, Weisbrod said.

Population is expected to grow by 50 percent in the region over the next 50 years, tripling the miles of congestion and lowering the average vehicle speed by 20 percent. That costs area businesses time and money and will likely result in job loss as existing businesses relocate to other metropolitan areas in order to remain competitive.

The Portland area business community has already been hurt by congestion. Intel Corp., which helped fund the study, has moved its shipment departure times from Portland International Airport up two hours due to peak hour congestion, for example. And OrePac has reported a 7 percent to 8 percent increase in inventories to mitigate for congestion delays.

Area businesses have responded to the impending crisis with unprecedented participation in transportation planning activities.
"This is the first time the business community and Metro have come together in this way to jointly sponsor a study as important as this," said Sandra McDonough, president and CEO of the Portland Business Alliance. "We're really saying let's step back and let's define the problem first, so we have a common framework for how we're going to solve it in the future. Not all projects are created equal in terms of economic value and this study sets up a way for us to work together looking at this package of potential transportation improvements."
DATE: December 8, 2005

TO: JPACT

FROM: Andy Cotugno, Planning Director

SUBJECT: FY '07 Appropriations Requests – Recommendation

Staff is seeking policy guidance from JPACT on what to emphasize in the region’s FY '07 Transportation Appropriations request. Issues surrounding this are as follows:

1. The Oregon delegation has raised concerns about the region’s request for project earmarks being too long, asking the region to more aggressively set priorities.

2. Requests for earmarks for the past 3 years have been in the context of a 6-year reauthorization bill, which provides for much greater opportunity. This year’s request is in the context of an annual appropriations bill providing a much smaller opportunity in the highway program categories.

3. The region must seek earmarks for the transit program categories. Conversely, most of the highway program funds are distributed through formulas and many of the highway discretionary funding categories have already been earmarked in the authorization bill.

4. While the region faired extremely well with earmarks in the authorization bill, many are partial amounts. In the criteria originally established, sponsoring jurisdictions were expected to demonstrate how they could complete a logical project with a partial earmark.

5. JPACT has not established a policy direction for seeking earmarks, thereby producing requests from project sponsors that are of a very different character.
6. Projects not selected as priority for FY '07 appropriations earmark could be considered in future years or could be sought for funding through the MTIP, the STIP or through efforts to seek new funds through the legislature or ballot measure. The list of FY '07 requests compared to past earmarks are included attached.

Recommendations

1. JPACT should establish a regional program for earmarking requests from the transit program. A candidate list is as follows:

   a. I-205/Mall LRT $40.0 million
   b. Milwaukie DEIS $1.0 million
   c. Wilsonville-Beaverton Commuter Rail $27.5 million
   d. TriMet Bus Replacement $8.0 million
   e. SMART Multimodal Facility $1.75 million

2. JPACT should endorse earmarks from non-transportation appropriations bills that help further the regional transportation agenda. A candidate list is as follows:

   a. TriMet Communications System $12.0 million (Dept. of Homeland Security)
   b. S. Waterfront Streetcar $1.0 million (HUD $)
   c. Port: Columbia River Channel Deepening $40.0 Million (Energy & Water Appropriations)

3. JPACT should set highway earmarking priorities as follows:

   a. All earmark requests should be in the financially constrained portion of the RTP.
   b. Requests should be limited to a dollar amount and category that is appropriate. Based upon historical experience, this means requests should generally be no greater than $5 million.
   c. Requests should be only for work that can be obligated within the timeframe of this bill, not simply requests to accumulate over multiple bills for a later date. Only ask for projects and project amounts sufficient to complete the next logical step or a finance plan to complete the phase (i.e. enough to complete PE, right-of-way acquisition or construction). Do not allow requests that are simply a partial payment toward one of these steps.
   d. Recognize that jurisdictions will seek earmarks outside the JPACT process but these are strictly the request of that jurisdiction and are not sanctioned as part of the regional program and any funding gap will be the responsibility of that jurisdiction, not the MTIP or STIP.
e. JPACT should establish a priority list as follows:

Require Portland, ODOT, Metro and the Port of Portland and each County in cooperation with the Cities of each County to submit 2 or fewer priority projects. If this is not possible, submit the list in priority order for JPACT to decide which to include. The following is a preliminary list of priorities to be considered:

**Portland – in the following priority order:**
1. **Portland: South Waterfront Access** $5.0 million
2. **Portland: E. Burnside/Couch** $4.7 million
   - **Portland: I-5/I-84-Greeley** $1.0 million (Not Ranked)
   - **Portland: Going St. Bridge** $1.0 million (Not Ranked)

**Multnomah County and Cities of Multnomah County - in the following priority order:**
1. **Multnomah County: Sellwood Bridge** $3.0 million
2. **Gresham: Springwater/US 26 Access** $5.0 million
3. **Gresham: Fairview Trail** $1.0 million

**Clackamas County and Cities of Clackamas County – as follows:**
- **Wilsonville: Kinsman Rd.** $2.0 million
- **Clackamas Co.: Beavercreek Road** $2.0 million

**Washington County and Cities of Washington County - in the following priority order:**
1. **I-5/99W Connector** $2.5 million
2. **Washington County: Century Blvd. Bridge** $5.5 million

**Port of Portland - in the following priority order:**
1. **Port: I-205/Airport Way Interchange (PE)** $1.0 million
2. **Port: I-84/257th Interchange** $1.0 million

**ODOT Priority:**
- **I-5 Columbia River Crossing** $5.0 million

**Metro Priority:**
- **Metro TOD Revolving Fund** $5.0 million
## DRAFT Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Map Number</th>
<th>Project Type/Name</th>
<th>Reauthorization Request</th>
<th>FY '06 Appropriations Request</th>
<th>FY '07 Appropriations Request</th>
<th>Congressional District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>35th Street Corridor</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1a</td>
<td>64-5 Delta Park to Lombard Widing</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1b</td>
<td>Highway/Transit Corridor</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1c</td>
<td>Highway/Transit Corridor</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-2</td>
<td>5-59W Corridor</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3</td>
<td>22nd-23rd St to US 26</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-4</td>
<td>Sunrise Project</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5</td>
<td>Sunrise Project Unit 2</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-6a</td>
<td>Central Corridor</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-6b</td>
<td>1st Ave. Access Road</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-7</td>
<td>6-200 Access Road</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-8</td>
<td>I-5/99W Connector</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-9b</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-9c</td>
<td>Portland Access Road</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-10</td>
<td>I-801/213 Interchange</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-11</td>
<td>Wilsonville Boeckman Road - Urban Village</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-12</td>
<td>Wilsonville/Beaverton Street Urban Village Corridor</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-13</td>
<td>Lake Road</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-14</td>
<td>Tualatin Valley Transitway</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-15</td>
<td>I-5/99W Connector</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-16</td>
<td>Milwaukie Lake Road</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-17</td>
<td>Portland Access Road</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-18</td>
<td>Portland Access Road</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-19</td>
<td>Portland Access Road</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-20</td>
<td>Wilsonville/Kinemon Rd.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-21</td>
<td>Wilsonville Access</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-22</td>
<td>Wilsonville Access</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: $124,000**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Map Number</th>
<th>Project Type/Name</th>
<th>Reauthorization Request</th>
<th>FY '06 Appropriations Request</th>
<th>FY '06 Appropriations Earmark</th>
<th>FY '07 Appropriations Request</th>
<th>Congressional District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>Designate Portland State University at National University Transportation Research Center</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2</td>
<td>Support for OTA Transit Request</td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3</td>
<td>City of Sandy Transit</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$38,700</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-4</td>
<td>City of Canby Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-5</td>
<td>Support for Other Priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-6*</td>
<td>Vancouver Area Smart Track</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$14,220</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-7</td>
<td>West Coast Coalition</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-8</td>
<td>Columbian River/BR Swing Span</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>$31,700</td>
<td>$53,014</td>
<td>$52,360</td>
<td>$18,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>I-7 and Snowy Bridges</td>
<td>$209,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>Domestically Produced Streetcar</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>I-205 and Airport Way</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>I-5 and Snowy Bridges</td>
<td>$83,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5</td>
<td>US 26 Widening South - Hwy 217 to Cornelius Pass</td>
<td>$8,992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-6</td>
<td>Hwy 99W - Tualatin Wildlife Refuge</td>
<td>$8,794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>$308,87</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: These projects are not mapped to a specific geography.

* Request to Washington Congressional Delegation.

** Appropriations amounts are approximate.
DATE: December 8, 2005
TO: JPACT Members and Interested Parties
FROM: Tom Kloster, Transportation Planning Manager
SUBJECT: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update

The Metro Council has initiated an update to the RTP that will be closely coordinated with the 2040 New Look, and culminate with a new 2035 RTP in December 2007. The update will address regional, state and federal planning requirements, and incorporate new policy direction stemming from the 2040 New Look. The update will occur in phases, as dictated by varying state and federal planning requirements. It will also incorporate a new approach to developing the federal financial constrained system using the “budgeting for outcomes” process described below.

In 2006, the update work program will include TEA-21 amendments to the existing RTP to ensure continued federal compliance and create a 2030 RTP. This phase will also include development of an updated RTP policy as the 2040 New Look growth scenarios are being developed and evaluated. In late 2006, the RTP update will move into the project development phase, with iterative rounds of network development and analysis used to define a program of transportation investments through 2035.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec '05</th>
<th>June '06</th>
<th>Dec '06</th>
<th>June '07</th>
<th>Dec '07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2030 Federal RTP</strong>&lt;br&gt;Update under TEA-21 regulations to extend federal certification and provide base for Priorities 2008-11 allocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**2040 New Look</td>
<td>RTP Policy Update**&lt;br&gt;Develop transportation scenarios and policy alternatives for the 2040 New Look. Update RTP policies in tandem with New Look recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2035 State and Federal RTP</strong>&lt;br&gt;Comprehensive update under SAFETEA regulations to extend federal certification and re-establish consistency with Oregon Statewide Planning Goals and the Oregon Transportation Plan. Implements 2040 New Look policies and strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priorities 2008-11</strong>&lt;br&gt;Biennial allocation of federal funds and update to the MTIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priorities 2008-11 Update

There will also be an update to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) during this period, beginning in Spring 2006 and concluding in early 2007. The MTIP update will be based on the 2030 RTP. The subsequent 2010-13 MTIP update will be based on the 2035 RTP, and incorporate SAFETEA regulations.

Budgeting for Outcomes

The RTP update will include expanded public outreach to reframe the discussion of public priorities and funding limitations that shape the development of the RTP. The goal is a more streamlined plan that better advances regional policies and public priorities, while adopting more realistic revenue assumptions that have traditionally been used in the RTP. The expanded outreach activities would be largely conducted by contractors in 2006. A detailed scope of the activities has been developed by Metro staff, and will be released for proposals in late 2005. This exercise will ultimately shape the federal financially constrained system in the 2035 RTP.

Federal Guidance under SAFETEA

The Federal Highway Administration has interpreted the new SAFETEA legislation provision for a 4-year planning cycle to apply only after an MPO has addressed the new SAFETEA planning requirements. Under this interpretation, Metro must update the RTP within the next year to prevent the current plan from lapsing. The RTP update work program therefore assumes a parallel track for a “housekeeping” update under the TEA-21 planning regulations in order to extend the window of federal certification as larger RTP issues are addressed in update.

Metro is also exploring the FHWA interpretation, and plans to request the agency to reconsider their position on the 4-year planning cycle, since all other aspects of the SAFETEA legislation are being implemented immediately.

Transportation Planning Rule and Oregon Highway Plan

The Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) is in the process of completing a major overhaul of the Transportation Planning Rule that will affect many aspects of the RTP update. Most of the new administrative rules will be incorporated into the 2035 RTP, while Metro expects to recommend “friendly amendments” on some state regulations as part of the post-acknowledgement review of the updated RTP. The 2035 RTP will also address new state policies set forth in the Oregon Transportation Plan, which is scheduled to be completed in early 2006.
November 10, 2005

Gloria M. Shepherd  
Director, Office of Planning  
Federal Highway Administration  
HEPP-1, Room 3301  
400 Seventh Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20590

Charles R. Goodman  
Director, Office of Systems Planning  
Federal Transit Administration  
TPE-10, Room 9413  
400 Seventh Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Ms. Shepherd and Mr. Goodman:

We are writing in response to a recent FHWA interpretation of the SAFETEA-LU interim guidance on metropolitan planning. Our understanding is that in a case involving New York metropolitan planning organizations, the FHWA has interpreted the new law that extends planning update cycles from three to four years to only apply to plans that have been certified to fully comply with SAFETEA-LU legislation. We are commenting on this interpretation in hopes that you might reconsider it as you prepare final guidance for the new legislation. At our recent meeting on November 4, 2005, Oregon MPO delegates representing the Portland, Eugene-Springfield, Salem-Keizer, Rogue Valley, Bend and Corvallis regions unanimously approved the following comments and recommendations on this interpretation:

Mixed Messages on SAFETEA-LU

The SAFETEA-LU legislation is not specific as to when the new planning cycle should be implemented, though it does specifically include provisions that make most aspects of the new law effective immediately. The only listed exceptions involve those cases where a plan update is underway, and in these cases the legislation seeks to avoid disruption of the update by introducing new requirements midway. These stipulations clearly reflect the desire of Congress to ensure that the new planning and programming practices in the law are adopted into local implementing ordinances as soon as reasonably possible, particularly given the long delay in reauthorization. The New York interpretation is at odds with this intent, since it seeks to delay implementation of SAFETEA-LU, and promotes old regulations that stem from the TEA-21 legislation, instead. If this approach reflected the intent of SAFETEA-LU, we believe that Congress would have specifically incorporated it in the legislation.
The New York interpretation of the FHWA interim guidance on 4-year planning cycles was especially surprising to Oregon MPOs because the interim guidance seems to clearly encourage the transition to the 4-year cycles with the following statements:

"While all TIPs, STIPs, and plans adopted after July 1, 2007, must comply with SAFETEA-LU planning provisions. States and MPOs may wish to take advantage of the SAFETEA-LU provisions prior to July 1, 2007, and they are encouraged to do so."

This section of the interim guidance clearly reflects the intent of SAFETEA-LU to "encourage" implementation of the new legislation as soon as possible, as a general guidance. If the FHWA did not intend to include the new 4-year planning cycles in this statement, then "plans" should not have been included in the general guidance.

"If plans and TIPs are prepared under the new update cycle described below, they must also comply with the expanded scope, consultation, mitigation, and participation requirements set forth in SAFETEA-LU. In addition, in no instance should the next update of a STIP or TIP be more than 4 years from the most recent update."

This section of the guidance underscores the encouragement of the new 4-year cycle by specifying the terms of the new provisions - that SAFETEA-LU requirements must be addressed in the new cycle. If FHWA had intended to prevent MPOs from using the new cycle, then this section of the guidance should have clearly stated as such.

Though we do not have written documentation of the reasoning behind the New York interpretation of the interim guidance, our understanding is that it is based on the notion that current plans are adopted under TEA-21 air quality conformity certifications, and thus must expire under the previous 3-year planning cycle. If this is the reasoning behind the New York interpretation, it should have been clearly stated in the following provisions of the interim guidance:

"Metropolitan Plan Cycles: Metropolitan transportation plans shall be updated at least every four years in air quality non-attainment and maintenance areas, and at least every five years in attainment areas. To align the MPO adoption of the transportation plan in non-attainment and maintenance areas and conformity determinations, the date of the FHWA/FTA conformity determination on the transportation plan is to be used as the basis for tracking update cycles in non-attainment and maintenance areas."

Instead, this section clearly implies that MPOs in air quality non-attainment and maintenance areas should base their new 4-year planning cycle on the most recent FHWA certification date. Thus, the New York interpretation seems at odds with your own interim guidance.

The net effect of the New York interpretation will be the opposite of both the interim guidance and SAFETEA-LU legislation, since limiting the timeframe for plan updates will encourage MPOs to complete updates under the old TEA-21 regulations, and avoid incorporating new provisions from the SAFETEA-LU legislation. In this way, the New York interpretation by FHWA is clearly at odds with legislative intent to "encourage" implementation of the new law.
Adopting a Progressive Approach

Beyond the nuts and bolts of interpreting the SAFETEA-LU law into guidance and possibly regulation, we believe that the FHWA should set a larger objective of simply promoting good planning. Instead, the New York interpretation, if formalized, would represent a step backward that promotes old law over new. We encourage the FHWA to consider a more progressive approach as you continue to develop guidance and regulations. The SAFETEA-LU changes to the transportation planning process were developed with a purpose, and your regulations ought to respect and embrace that intent.

As a starting point, we request that FHWA formalize the interpretation provided to the New York MPOs for the benefit of other MPOs around the country. If the interpretation is in error, then it would be a great relief for the Oregon MPOs, since it represents a major departure from what we understood the legislative intent and FHWA interim guidance to be. The New York interpretation will seriously affect our metropolitan planning activities over the next year, and surely other MPOs around the country will be equally affected. At a minimum, an interpretation of this significance should be formalized as a general communication from FHWA to MPOs so that we can adjust our planning schedules, as needed.

But more importantly, the larger purpose for the shift to a four-year cycle is lost in the FHWA interpretation. MPOs that are making the most earnest efforts to meet the full intent of federal regulations have had a difficult time working within the previous, three-year cycle. The end result was a nearly constant update process that added little value to our planning, and undermined other MPO activities, such as MTIP programming and development of federal management systems.

In Oregon, our state transportation planning rules go far beyond federal requirements, and further complicated our efforts to enact meaningful responses to the federal regulations in our plans under the old three-year cycle. Thus, the new four-year cycle provides a welcome adjustment that will greatly improve our ability to advance federal interests in our regions. We believe that the FHWA should embrace this opportunity to more effectively implement the provisions of SAFETEA-LU. Instead, the New York interpretation will be perceived by our local partners as a lack of FHWA interest in promoting good planning.

We also recognize that there are widely varying efforts given to metropolitan planning around the country, with Oregon at the forefront in the scope of what is accomplished through our plans. Given these varying efforts, we recommend that you give state-level FHWA officials the flexibility to encourage those MPOs adopting more ambitious plans to implement the 4-year cycle from the SAFETEA-LU. In Oregon, this would allow our state FHWA to work collaboratively with the MPOs to incorporate SAFETEA-LU provisions in our upcoming plan updates, and ensure prompt implementation of the new legislation. The following section of the interim guidance could be amended to include this authority for state FHWA officials:

"Implementation of the new 4-year cycle allowed for FHWA/FTA certification of planning processes in Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) is the responsibility of
Amending this section to simply include metropolitan plans would provide enough guidance for state FHWA officials and MPOs to incorporate SAFETEA-LU provisions in upcoming metropolitan planning activities. But if the FHWA is concerned about the relationship to air quality conformity certifications, this portion of the guidance could also specify how certifications could be adapted to the new 4-year cycle in TMAs. However, the key objective should be to advance SAFETEA-LU, and not old regulations.

The effects of the New York interpretation on our planning activities have been immediate and disruptive, adding significant costs and redundancy to our efforts to update metropolitan transportation plans in Oregon. For this reason, we request that FHWA provide a prompt clarification of the New York interpretation as soon as possible, so that we are able to proceed with our own planning efforts.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Councilor Rex Burkholder
Chair, Oregon MPO Consortium

cc: Representative Earl Blumenauer, District 3
    Representative Peter DeFazio, District 4
    Governor Ted Kulongoski
    Members, Oregon MPO Consortium
    David Cox, Federal Highway Administration
    Deborah L. Singer, Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations
    Lorna Youngs, Interim Director, ODOT
**2035 Regional Transportation Plan**

**A New Look at Transportation**

**MAJOR MILESTONES**

**Phase 1: Scoping**
Now to February 2006

- Engage stakeholders
- Identify key issues/questions to be resolved
- Draft work program
- State of Transportation in the Region report (system conditions and issues)
- Targeted public involvement

**Phase 2: 2040 Research and Policy Development**
April to December 2006

- Ongoing coordination with 2040 New Look process
- Develop base revenue forecast
- State of Transportation Finance in the Region report
- 2035 base case needs analysis
- Develop and stage public opinion survey
- Identify public transportation priorities
- Develop transportation scenarios and policy alternatives for 2040 New Look
- Targeted public involvement

**Decision**
March 2006

- Adopt work program and communication strategy

**Phase 3: System Development and Policy Analysis**
February to December 2007

- Adopt financial forecast
- Adopt 2040 New Look policy direction for RTP (including future growth vision)*
- Adopt preferred 2035 forecast*

**Decision**
January 2007

- Identify financially constrained and illustrative projects
- Analyze transportation systems
- Update plan components
  - policies and system maps
  - modal targets
  - performance indicators
  - corridor refinement plans
  - regulations
  - other elements as needed
- Conformity analysis
- Targeted public involvement

**Phase 4: Post-Adoption**
Federal and State Consultation
January to March 2008

- Adopt 2035 RTP:
  - Project lists
  - Performance indicators
  - Regulations
  - New urban area and corridor planning work program
  - Regional investment strategy
  - State/federal findings

**Inter-related activities**
- 2040 New Look
- Regional Freight Plan

*Adopted as part of New Look activities in December 2006

November 29, 2005
Policy Questions

- What set of integrated and coordinated investments in streets, arterials, highways, transit service, sidewalks, bikeways, demand management, and system management (e.g., incident response, intelligent transportation systems) would do the most to achieve our Region 2040 growth concept elements and economic and community development goals?

- How can the New Look scenarios best foster a broad discussion of distinct land use and transportation choices?

- How should the plan be updated to ensure it reflects the public's transportation priorities and their willingness to pay for those services and infrastructure?

- How can the current corridor-based planning approach in implementing the Region 2040 growth concept and RTP be improved to better integrate a comparative analysis of alternative investments in multiple corridors and/or modes?

- What indicators can best monitor whether the transportation system is successful in meeting regional goals and policies?

- What set of land use and transportation policies and tools should be adopted to protect the public's investment in the transportation infrastructure?

- What is the appropriate balance of regulations versus incentives in implementing the RTP?

- What is the role of the RTP in addressing local inequity in funding transportation?

- Should the RTP establish a comprehensive policy that links transportation investments to natural resources and wildlife corridor protection and restoration?

- How should demand management tools (e.g., parking management, value pricing, individualized marketing) be evaluated? How should the most effective tools be implemented?

- What policies and directives should guide regional funding cycles and investment strategies?
November 8, 2005

Dear JPACT Members,

At our October 27, 2005 meeting, the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 05-3616A “for the Purpose of Updating the Work Program for Corridor Refinement Planning.”

During the meeting, the Council had considerable discussion about the relationship of these corridor plans to our current effort to take a new look at the choices we face as the region plans for the future. This project will examine how we grow in the existing urban portions of the region; how to create great new communities in areas added to the urban growth boundary; and how to balance urban and agricultural needs and respect the concerns of neighboring communities as the region expands.

The Council anticipates that this regional analysis will become the foundation for several implementing decisions in the future, including UGB expansions and the Regional Transportation Plan. As you know, the RTP update will also be based upon realistic assumptions about available financial resources.

While the Metro Council understands the importance of building needed transportation improvements, we also believe that corridor studies should be conducted in the context of these broader efforts. By reviewing the conclusions of these studies upon completion of the updates of both the RTP and the region’s long-range growth management plan, we can ensure that transportation projects are consistent with and reinforce any new policy direction on regional transportation or land use matters.
We look forward to any opportunity to discuss this with the committee at your November 10 meeting or another appropriate time.

Sincerely,

David Bragdon
Metro Council President

Rex Burkholder
Deputy President, District 5

Rod Park
Metro Councilor, District 1

Brian Newman
Metro Councilor, District 2

Carl Hosticka
Metro Councilor, District 3

Susan McLain
Metro Councilor, District 4

Robert Liberty
Metro Councilor, District 6
BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE FY 2006 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM ) RESOLUTION NO. 06- 3651 )
 ) Introduced by Rex Burkholder

WHEREAS, the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) describes all federally funded transportation planning activities for the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area to be conducted in FY 2006; and

WHEREAS, approval for new funding and projects to the FY 2006 UPWP requires Metro Council consent; and

WHEREAS, the State of Oregon Department of Transportation increased Metro’s PL contract by $438,380; and

WHEREAS, the budgets and draft scopes of work to be included in the Unified Planning Work Program are attached as Exhibits A-N; and

WHEREAS, Metro will participate in joint project with Oregon and Washington Departments of Transportation for the Columbia River Crossing Project; and

WHEREAS, the Columbia River Crossing Project will be funded by an Intergovernmental Agreement through the Washington State Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Columbia River Crossing Project UPWP budget and scope of work is attached as Exhibit H; and

WHEREAS, Metro received a Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) grant to complete a regional freight study as identified in UPWP in Exhibit I; and

WHEREAS, four new local planning studies have been identified for fiscal year 2005-06 in the 2006-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP); and

WHEREAS, Metro will participate in the administration of these planning activities through agreements with the Oregon Department of Transportation and a local city transportation agency, and

WHEREAS, the budgets and draft scopes of work to be included in the Unified Planning Work Program are attached as Exhibits J-M; and

WHEREAS, ODOT will amend the ODOT- Metro Marketing Agreement for Regional Travel Options to develop a travel options marketing campaign; and

WHEREAS, the management of the Regional Travel Options partner contracts has transitioned from TriMet to Metro which increases Metro’s use of Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ) funds previously allocated through the Metro Transportation Improvement Program as a pass through to subcontractors; and
WHEREAS, Metro has applied to receive the CMAQ funds; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council approves the following UPWP amendments:
1. The $438,380 amendment in Federal Highway Planning funds
2. The addition of $75,000 to the Freight Study program through a TGM grant
3. The addition of an intergovernmental agreement to provide $409,468 for Metro's support on the Columbia River Crossing Project.
4. Inclusion of four new local planning projects of regional significance.
5. The $586,600 amendment to the ODOT Marketing Agreement for the Regional Travel Options program.
6. The addition of $433,372 to Regional Travel Options in CMAQ funding.
7. Metro's Chief Operating Officer is authorized to apply for, accept and execute grants and agreements specified in the UPWP.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this day ___________ of January 2006

______________________________
David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to Form:

______________________________
Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney
### Metro FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO</th>
<th>FY06 ODOT</th>
<th>key 134703</th>
<th>06 STP*</th>
<th>FY06 ODOT</th>
<th>key 133003</th>
<th>06 STP*</th>
<th>FY06 ODOT</th>
<th>key 133003</th>
<th>FHWA TRANSIMS</th>
<th>Other Funds (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06PL</td>
<td>553,378</td>
<td>177,246</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>73,527</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>31,533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td>19,836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>27,285</td>
<td>284,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 STP*</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>20,809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td>19,836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 STP*</td>
<td>14,320</td>
<td>49,725</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>20,692</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,643</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 STP*</td>
<td>21,005</td>
<td>57,220</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>32,456</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>55,524</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 STP*</td>
<td>30,192</td>
<td>27,560</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>4,617</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 STP*</td>
<td>86,373</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>63,336</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 STP*</td>
<td>275,132</td>
<td>211,712</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>16,027</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 STP*</td>
<td>375,132</td>
<td>211,712</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>16,027</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 STP*</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>4,357</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>3,087</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation Planning
1. Regional Transportation Planning
2. Green Streets Program
3. Livable Streets Program
4. 2040 Performance Indicators
5. Real Mobility Program/CMIS/ITS
6. Urban Growth Boundary Planning
7. 2040 Re-Evaluation - Trans Support
8. Bike There! Walk There
9. Metro Transportation Improv Prog
10. Damascus Area Planning Program

### Research & Modeling
1. Trans Model Improvement Prog
2. Model Development Program
3. Model System Monitoring
4. Technical Assistance Program
5. Data, Growth Monitoring

### Administrative Services
1. Mgmt & Coord/Grants Mgmt
2. Technical Assistance Program
3. Data, Growth Monitoring

### Corridor Planning
1. 1/395/Portland Mall Light Rail Proj
2. Milwaukee Light Rail SOKS
3. Willamette Shoreline AA

### Exhibit A to Resolution No. 06-3651

- Federal Aid Numbers: Damascus: STP-C000(015)
- Anticipated funding sources: 10,851,104
### METRO

#### Transportation Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>06 PL ODOT Budget</th>
<th>PL Adjust.</th>
<th>Revised 06 PL ODOT</th>
<th>08 STP Budget</th>
<th>STP Adjust.</th>
<th>Revised STP Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>304,378</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>454,378</td>
<td></td>
<td>177,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Streets Program</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td>19,838</td>
<td>19,836</td>
<td>19,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livable Streets Program</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>20,899</td>
<td>20,899</td>
<td>20,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Performance Indicators</td>
<td>14,320</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,320</td>
<td>49,725</td>
<td>49,725</td>
<td>49,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regl Mobility Program/CMS/ITS</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,652</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Growth Boundary Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218,113</td>
<td>57,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Re-Evaluation - Trans Support</td>
<td>378,113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>57,229</td>
<td>57,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike There! Walk There</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,636</td>
<td>34,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transportation Improv Prog</td>
<td>55,340</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,340</td>
<td>131,403</td>
<td>131,403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus Area Planning Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Research & Modeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>06 PL ODOT Budget</th>
<th>08 STP Budget</th>
<th>STP Adjust.</th>
<th>Revised STP Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trans Model Improvement Prog</td>
<td></td>
<td>111,293</td>
<td>111,293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Development Program</td>
<td>152,037</td>
<td>55,254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans System Monitoring</td>
<td>20,422</td>
<td>38,192</td>
<td>38,192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data, Growth Monitoring</td>
<td>86,373</td>
<td>211,712</td>
<td>211,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Administrative Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>06 PL ODOT Budget</th>
<th>PL Adjust.</th>
<th>Revised 06 PL ODOT</th>
<th>08 STP Budget</th>
<th>STP Adjust.</th>
<th>Revised STP Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgmnt &amp; Coord/Grants Mgmnt</td>
<td>344,132</td>
<td></td>
<td>344,132</td>
<td>211,712</td>
<td></td>
<td>211,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice/Title VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Corridor Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>06 PL ODOT Budget</th>
<th>PL Adjust.</th>
<th>Revised 06 PL ODOT</th>
<th>08 STP Budget</th>
<th>STP Adjust.</th>
<th>Revised STP Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/205/Portland Mall Light Rail Proj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Light Rail SDEIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Shoreline AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside Transit AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transportation Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>06 PL ODOT Budget</th>
<th>PL Adjust.</th>
<th>Revised 06 PL ODOT</th>
<th>08 STP Budget</th>
<th>STP Adjust.</th>
<th>Revised STP Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>123,204</td>
<td>519,378</td>
<td>(147,000)</td>
<td>372,378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 217 Corridor Refinement Plan</td>
<td>9,673</td>
<td>9,673</td>
<td>86,883</td>
<td>147,000</td>
<td>233,883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-State Coordination</td>
<td>33,044</td>
<td>33,044</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Freight Plan</td>
<td>46,871</td>
<td>46,871</td>
<td>92,049</td>
<td>92,049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Trans Planning Financing</td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td>19,515</td>
<td>19,515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Travel Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Metro Subtotal**: 1,634,418 - 1,634,418 - 1,654,547 - 1,654,547
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### Metro UPWP PL Revision Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRO</th>
<th>206 PL ODOT Budget</th>
<th>PL Amend.</th>
<th>Revised 206 PL ODOT Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>454,378</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>553,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Green Streets Program</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Livable Streets Program</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 2040 Performance Indicators</td>
<td>14,320</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Regi Mobility Program/CMS/ITS</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Urban Growth Bouney Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 2040 Re-Evaluation - Trans Support</td>
<td>218,113</td>
<td></td>
<td>218,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bike There Walk There</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Metro Transportation Impvr Program</td>
<td>55,340</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>155,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Damascus Area Planning Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research &amp; Modeling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Trans Model Improvement Prog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Model Development Program</td>
<td>152,037</td>
<td>88,380</td>
<td>240,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trans System Monitoring</td>
<td>20,422</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Technical Assistance Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Data, Growth Monitoring</td>
<td>86,373</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mgmt &amp; Coord/Grants Mgmt</td>
<td>344,132</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>375,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Environmental Justice/Title VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I205/Portland Mall Light Rail Proj</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Milwaukie Light Rail SDEIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Willamette Shoreline AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Eastside Transit AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transit Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Project Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Next Corridor</td>
<td>123,204</td>
<td></td>
<td>123,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hwy 217 Corridor Refinement Plan</td>
<td>9,673</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bi-State Coordination</td>
<td>33,044</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Regional Freight Plan</td>
<td>46,871</td>
<td></td>
<td>46,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Regional Trans Planning Financing</td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Regional Travel Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Metro Subtotal** | 1,634,418 | 438,380.00 | 2,072,798
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PROGRAM

The adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) serves as a policy and investment blueprint for long-range improvements to the region’s transportation system. The RTP is updated regularly to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations, and to reflect evolving travel and economic trends and any subsequent changes in the region’s transportation needs. The 2004 RTP established necessary updates to the projects and policies to ensure continued compliance with federal regulations. Local transportation plans in the region must conform to the RTP under provisions of the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Metro provides ongoing technical and policy support for local transportation planning activities. The RTP Program also includes corridor studies conducted in cooperation with the state and local jurisdictions.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

The RTP responds to both state and federal mandates, but also carries out a broad range of regional planning objectives for implementing the 2040 Growth Concept. The following are mandates for the upcoming fiscal year:

RTP Update: An update is scheduled to begin in Fall 2005, with completion of federal requirements anticipated in late 2006, prior to the March 5, 2007 lapse date for the current RTP. Amendments identified in local and regional corridor planning efforts will be incorporated as well as a new horizon year of 2035 for project planning and systems analysis. It also will re-establish conformity with air quality regulations, and all other planning factors called out in federal regulations and in corrective actions identified in the 2004 federal triennial review that have not already been addressed through separate actions. This update will include development of a new financially constrained transportation system that will become the basis for upcoming funding allocations. The update will also implement “New Look” policies resulting from the upcoming re-evaluation of the 2040 Growth Concept.

Local Transportation System Plan (TSP) Support: Metro will continue to work closely with local jurisdictions during the next fiscal year to ensure regional policies and projects are enacted through local plans. This work element will include the following activities:

- Professional support for technical analysis and modeling required as part of local plan updates
- Professional support at the local level to assist in development of local policies, programs and regulations that implement the RTP
- Written and spoken testimony in support of proposed amendments to local plans
- Provide public information and formal presentations to local government committees, commissions and elected bodies as well as interested citizen, civic and business groups on the RTP

Management Systems: the federally mandated Congestion Management System (CMS) was first incorporated into the RTP as part of the 2000 update, and the CMS will be expanded as part of the upcoming update to incorporate new recommendations from the FHWA. The updated RTP will implement a CMS Roadmap that responds to federal corrective actions identified during the 2004 triennial review. Key activities for FY 2005-06 will be to create processes that incorporate CMS information into planning activities, initiate system monitoring based upon management-system performance measures, complete local project review for consistency with the CMS and ongoing data collection and input to keep the CMS current. As part of the CMS work program, Metro will also establish a steering group of key CMS partners, including Portland State University, ODOT, TriMet and other major transportation providers.

Regional Transportation and Information: A transportation “annual report” will be prepared detailing key RTP policies and strategies. The report will list information and data commonly requested by the public and media, including supporting text and graphics. Data collected, as...
part of the CMS will also be incorporated into this report. The report will include a user-friendly, public-release version as well as a Technical Appendix. This objective will be completed in coordination with the 2040 Performance Indicators project.

Public Involvement: Metro will continue to provide an ongoing presence with local citizen, civic and business groups interested in the RTP as well as public agencies involved in local plan updates. The work site will be continually upgraded and expanded to include emphasis on 2000 RTP implementation as well as an online public forum for transportation and other planning issues.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Metro Council
- Regional partner agencies and members of the public
- TPAC and MTAC
- JPACT and MPAC
- Regional Transportation Council (RTC) of metropolitan Clark County, Washington
- Adjacent planning organizations, including Mid-Willamette Area Commission on Transportation (MWACT) and Northwest Area Commission on Transportation (NWACT)

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES

- Publish an the 2004 RTP document
- Complete and publish the RTP Technical Appendix for regional distribution
- Complete follow-up studies on street design and connectivity
- Expand the web presence of the RTP to include a public forum and implementation tools
- Coordinate and provide technical assistance in local transportation system plan development and adoption
- Continue to coordinate regional corridor refinement plans identified within the RTP with ODOT's Corridor Studies
- Maintain database consistent with changes in population and employment forecasts, travel-demand projections for people and goods, cost and revenue estimates and amendments to local comprehensive plans. Produce a corresponding "annual report" highlighting key information and trends
- Participate with local jurisdictions involved in implementation and development of local transportation system plans
- Initiate a CMS steering group to oversee CMS program development, and incorporation of CMS data into the RTP process
- Approval of a schedule for the 2007 RTP

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

A major update to the RTP began in FY 1995-96 and concluded in early FY 2000-01, with the adoption of the 2000 RTP in August 2000. The purpose of the update was twofold: first, the plan had to meet the State TPR requirements. Among other provisions, the rule seeks to reduce reliance upon the automobile and promote the use of alternative modes of transportation. Second, the update reflected the ongoing Region 2040 planning effort. The RTP now serves as the transportation element of the Regional Framework Plan. During the four-year process, the update advanced through three distinct phases: (1) policy revisions in 1996 (approved by Metro Council resolution), (2) system alternatives analysis in 1997 and (3) project development and analysis in 1998-99. Finally, an adoption phase occurred from December 1999 to August 2000.

The 2000 RTP established consistency with federal regulations for development of a financially constrained transportation system. The RTP financially constrained system was created in partnership with ODOT, TriMet and local governments using state forecasts generated by ODOT. The 2000 RTP also addresses all planning factors called for in federal regulations. As such, the
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

RTP functions as an element of the Oregon Highway Plan for the metropolitan region, and establishes eligibility for use of federal funds in transportation projects.

The State TPR required the 25 cities and 3 counties in the Metro region to update local plans to be consistent with the RTP within one year of the August 10, 2000 adoption date. To assist local jurisdictions, a number of supporting fact sheets were produced along with other materials to help local officials interpret the new plan. In 2002, many jurisdictions were still involved in local transportation updates to implement the new regional policies. Specific Metro staff were assigned to each implementing jurisdiction and worked closely with their staff to ensure those local-plan updates proceeded successfully. Though State TPRs require the local plans to be updated within one year, it is likely that several jurisdictions will need more time to fully address the new RTP.

The 2000 RTP also included a number of "refinement plans" for corridors where more detailed work is needed to identify specific transportation needs. In 2001, Metro completed the Corridor Initiatives project, thereby establishing an implementation program for these corridor studies. It was adopted as an amendment to the RTP Appendix. In 2002, JPACT and the Metro Council adopted a package of "post-acknowledgement" amendments that were largely required as part of state approval of the RTP in 2001.

In late 2003, the 2004 Federal Update to the RTP was adopted to address federal planning requirements that must be considered in a three-year ongoing basis. In FY 2004-05, an update began that addressed both state and federal requirements, and replaces the 2000 Plan. The work plan accommodated both the Metro Council direction to incorporate lessons and policy initiatives from the 2040 Growth Concept Review and requirements to maintain an RTP that meets federal regulations for transportation planning and air quality.

BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>ODOT Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$551,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$169,050</td>
<td>$164,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$179,000</td>
<td>$73,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,178</td>
<td>$16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$31,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$21,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$864,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$864,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Full-Time FTE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROGRAM

The 2004 Federal Update to the RTP identified hundreds of needed improvements throughout the region, including numerous capacity improvements and system-management projects aimed at relieving congestion in chronic traffic “hot spots.” The RTP is also largely unfunded, which means that congestion-relief projects may not proceed in a timely manner. The Regional Mobility Program seeks to monitor the ongoing effects of congestion on livability and the regional economy, the degree to which delayed improvements are compounding these effects, and develop multi-modal strategies for coping with the gap in needed improvements.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

The Regional Mobility Program encompasses federal mandates to maintain “congestion management” and “intelligent transportation” systems. This work implements the Congestion Management System (CMS) Road Map required as part of the 2003 federal certification review. These programs are already largely incorporated into the RTP and include:

- **Inventory of Congestion Hot Spots**: Staff will work closely with TPAC, ODOT, the Port of Portland and local jurisdictions to develop and maintain an inventory of known congestion hot spots. This element will be conducted in concert with data inventory requirements of the Congestion Management System.
- **Ranking of Congestion Hot Spots**: Metro will work with TPAC, ODOT and local jurisdictions to develop ranking criteria for evaluating the relative magnitude of known congestion hot spots, including measures addressing safety, system mobility and relative accessibility. These criteria will be used to develop a ranked list of congestion relief projects, incorporating existing RTP projects and others identified through this effort.
- **Congestion Action Plan**: Working with JPACT and Metro Council, develop an action plan for implementing multi-modal congestion relief projects, including specific funding strategies for unfunded improvements. This work may be coordinated with a proposed regional transportation funding initiative in 2004.
- **Public Involvement**: All activities require early, ongoing and responsive public involvement techniques, consistent with Metro public involvement policies. Newly-developed procedures to address environmental justice issues will be applied to this effort.

The region’s intelligent transportation activities are further guided by the TransPort Committee, a multi-agency group of system providers involved in implementing intelligent transportation policy. In early 2005, the role of this group as a Subcommittee of TPAC was formalized.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Metro Council
- Regional partner agencies and members of the public
- TPAC
- JPACT

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES

Objectives for FY 2005-06 include:

- Prepare and map an inventory of congestion hot spots that affect the regional transportation system.
- Develop criteria for ranking congestion hot spots. Prepare a ranked list of proposed congestion relief projects that improve movement of people and goods for review by JPACT and Metro Council.

Exhibit C
Regional Mobility Program - Congestion Management - ITS

- Support JPACT and the Metro Council in their efforts to implement a financial strategy for completing improvements in a timely manner.
- Complete a CMS Roadmap in response to the 2003 Federal Triennial Review corrective action.
- Increase Metro’s involvement with the TransPort Committee.
- Establish a CMS steering group in partnership with Portland State University, ODOT, TriMet, and other local ITS providers to help guide implementation of the CMS Roadmap.
- Conduct regional CMS training opportunities in partnership with the Federal Highway Administration.
- Develop a Congestion Management System procedure manual defining data collection and publication requirements.
- Integrate CMS data collection with the bi-annual 2040 Performance Indicators report and other periodic reporting activities.
- Continue to develop new innovations in congestion monitoring as part of evolving the region’s congestion management strategy.

Accomplishments of This Program to Date

The RTP Update was completed in August 2000 with two purposes: first, it had to meet requirements set forth in the state TPR. Among other provisions, the rule seeks to reduce reliance upon the automobile and promote use of alternative modes of transportation. Second, revisions must reflect the ongoing Region 2040 planning effort and serve as the transportation element of the Regional Framework Plan. Together, these state and regional policy initiatives are expected to go far in slowing growth in travel demand and congestion in the region.

A new congestion policy in the 2000 RTP recognizes that different congestion measures should be applied in different areas. In the updated plan, the peak-hour congestion standard is relaxed in densely developed areas with high-quality transit, for example, since these areas are less dependent upon motor vehicles as a means of travel. The standard is higher in major statewide “through-traffic” corridors and key-freight connections.

The remaining congestion relief projects within the 2000 RTP were developed subject to congestion management system provisions within the plan. These provisions require jurisdictions to consider other solutions, such as alternative mode improvements, before making capacity improvements to address congestion. These provisions resulted in a combination of capacity projects and alternative mode improvements in situations where alternative mode projects were not sufficient to meet projected travel need.

In 2003, a Federal Update to the 2000 RTP was completed, with an expanded system of projects eligible for federal funding and new revenues identified for future improvements. However, the RTP is still substantially under-funded, despite new revenues.

Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL $ 24,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match $ 21,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>ODOT Support $ 16,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5303 $ 3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TriMet $ 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro $ 2,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL $ 71,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM

The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is a critical tool for implementing the Regional Transportation Plan and 2040 Growth Concept. The MTIP is a multi-year program that allocates federal and state funds available for transportation system improvement purposes in the Metro region. Updated every two years, the MTIP allocates funds to specific projects, based upon technical and policy considerations that weigh the ability of individual projects to implement regional goals. The MTIP is also subject to federal and state air quality requirements, and a determination is made during each allocation to ensure that the updated MTIP conforms to air quality laws. These activities require special coordination with staff from ODOT and other regional, county, and city agencies as well as significant public-involvement efforts.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

The MTIP is entering the third year of a major reorganization of both the policy and database components. The objective of the MTIP reorganization is to emphasize tangible, built results where citizens will see Metro regional growth management programs in action through transportation improvements. MTIP allocations have been increasingly judged against their ability to help implement the 2040 Growth Concept. This has been accomplished through a system of technical scoring and special project categories that place emphasis on 2040 centers, industry, and ports.

The program relies on a complex database of projects and funding sources that must be maintained on an ongoing basis to ensure availability of federal funds to local jurisdictions. The two-year updates set the framework for allocating these funds. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) monitors this process closely, to ensure that federal funds are being spent responsibly, and in keeping with federal mandates for transportation and air quality. Metro also partners closely with the State of Oregon to coordinate project selection and database management with STIP.

In 2005, Metro will transition into a new role of guiding project development for planning activities funded through the MTIP, at the request of the Oregon Department of Transportation. This new activity will involve expanding Metro's professional capabilities to include a licensed professional engineer, and establishing project oversight protocols to guide our review.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Metro Council
- Regional partner agencies and members of the public
- TPAC
- JPACT

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES

The following are MTIP program objectives for FY 2005-06:

MTIP/STIP Update: Metro will begin the Priorities 2006-09 update; implementing updated MTIP policies and project review criteria for the next funding cycle. The updated MTIP will be published in complete and executive summary formats. Continued conformity with federal air quality standards will be demonstrated. The timing of this update will also bring the Metro program into alignment with the STIP.

Database Maintenance: Metro will provide ODOT and local jurisdictions essential funding information to better schedule project implementation activities. Metro will also monitor past and current funding allocations and project schedules to manage cost variations from initial project estimates, and produce quarterly reports that document funding authorizations, obligations and
reserves by funding category and jurisdiction. Metro will also produce an annual report required by FHWA that reflects current costs, schedules, priorities, actual appropriations and other actions approved throughout the year. The annual report will address progress and/or delays in implementing major projects as mandated by ISTEA.

Other MTIP activities for FY 2005-06:

- Develop a long-term program to diversify funding opportunities beyond the current scope of federal funds, implementing regional policy through a combination of transportation and other funding sources on an ongoing basis
- Develop a local partnership initiative, to provide improved linkage between local capital improvement plans (LCIP) and the MTIP and determine what combination of funding and regulatory incentives would be most effective in drawing local funds toward regional policy goals
- Create a public-awareness program in coordination with Metro and agency communications staff to promote regional policies at the time of project construction and completion, including public signage, dedication activities and a significantly-expanded web resource on projects built with MTIP funds
- Conduct a block analysis on the areas surrounding each project submitted for funding consideration to ensure that environmental justice principles are met and to identify where additional outreach might be beneficial
- Expand the MTIP public awareness program to include printed materials, web resources and possibly a short video for use by public access broadcasters
- Work with ODOT and Metro's Data Resource Center to develop broad agency and public electronic access to a common MTIP database
- Continue to update the MTIP hardware/software platform to improve production of specialized report formats, cross connection with ODOT data sources and other database refinements
- Continue to coordinate inter-agency consultation on air quality conformity as required by state regulations. Conduct full public outreach (including notification), reports and public hearings that are required as part of the conformity process
- Adopt a new project development role to provide oversight of project planning activities funded through the MTIP.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

In early 2002, a major update of MTIP policies and review criteria was launched in anticipation of the Priorities 2004-07 MTIP update. The purpose of this effort was to reorganize the MTIP to create a high profile, positive process for allocating federal funds, and reinforcing the region’s commitment to implement the 2040 Growth Concept and RTP.

FY 2004 saw completion of the Priorities 2004-07 update to the MTIP and allocation of $52 million in transportation funds to regional projects. The 2004-07 update included a demonstration of ongoing conformity with air quality laws. In November 2001, FHWA staff review identified a number of corrective actions, which were incorporated into this updated MTIP. A final draft of the updated MTIP was published in December 2003.
### BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>287,561</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>158,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>95,736</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
<td>131,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>ODOT Support</td>
<td>33,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>8,704</td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
<td>13,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>414,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION/GRANTS MANAGEMENT

PROGRAM

Provide for overall ongoing department management, including budget, UPWP, contracts, grants and personnel. It also includes staff to meet required needs of TPAC, JPACT, MTAC, Bi-State Coordination Committee, Highway 217 Corridor Policy Advisory Committee (Hwy. 217 PAC), Regional Freight Committee, RTO Subcommittee, HTAC and the Metro Council.

JPACT serves as the MPO for the region in a unique partnership that requires joint action with the Metro Council on MPO matters. The MPO purpose is to ensure that federal programs unique to urban areas are effectively implemented.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

Ensure compliance with all federal requirements. Maintain "certification" of the region for continued receipt of transit and highway construction funds. Provide documentation to the FHWA and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) of all such activity.

Provide support to: JPACT; TPAC; MTAC; Bi-State Committee, HWY 217 PAC; Regional Freight Committee; and subcommittees to ensure coordination between state, regional and local transportation and land-use plans and priorities.

Provide overall department management, including budget, personnel, materials, services and capital expenditures. Monitor and ensure grants and contracts compliance including OMB A-133 Single Audit. Provide information to the public. Participate in periodic coordination meetings with other state MPOs and transit agencies. Also, maintain active memberships and support in national organizations such as Cascadia, American Public Transportation Association (APTA) and the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) as available funds allow.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Federal, state and local funding agencies
- Local jurisdictions
- TPAC
- JPACT
- Metro Council
- Oregon MPO Consortium

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES

- Prepare and manage the department budget, personnel, programs and products
- FY 2006-07 UPWP/Self Certification
- Prepare documentation to FHWA, FTA and other funding agencies such as quarterly narrative and financial reports
- Monthly progress reports to TPAC
- Minutes, agendas and documentation
- Execute, administer and monitor contracts, grants and agreements
- Periodic review with FHWA and FTA on UPWP progress
- Federal Certification
- Single audit responsibility for Planning grants
- Comprehensively review the JPACT Bylaws to consider representation by smaller cities and SMART
- Execute a planning coordination agreement with SMART
- Continue to monitor current air quality conformity regulations and evaluation practices, as applicable to MPO conformity requirements
- Continue to participate in MPO coordination activities through the Oregon MPO Consortium and in quarterly MPO technical meetings
MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION/GRANTS MANAGEMENT

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

This is an ongoing program.

BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>$374,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
<td>$214,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>ODOT Support</td>
<td>$16,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>$51,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$695,718</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full-Time Equivalent Staffing**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit E
PROGRAM

The program implements multi-modal RTP projects and policies for major transportation corridors. It involves ongoing involvement in local and regional transit and roadway project conception, funding and design.

Metro has traditionally participated in local project-development activities for regionally funded transportation projects. In recent years, the Project Development Program has focused on projects that directly relate to completion of planning and project development activities in regional transportation corridors outlined in the RTP. A few of these corridors already had major planning efforts underway under separate budget lines. However, for the bulk of the corridors project development is still needed. This program coordinates with local and state planning efforts to ensure consistency with regional projects, plans and policies. It will also support initiation of new corridor planning efforts to be led by Metro or others.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

As provided by the State TPR, Metro is required to complete a regional Transportation System Plan, which identifies the need for transportation facilities and their function, mode and general location. The 2000 RTP calls for completion of 18 specific corridor refinements and studies for areas where significant needs were identified but which require further analysis before a specific project can be developed. Section 660-012-0025 of the TPR requires prompt completion of corridor refinements and studies.

In FY 2001, the Corridor Initiatives Program prioritized completion of the corridor plans and refinements. Per that recommendation, Metro initiated and led corridor studies for the Powell/Foster and Highway 217 corridors. In Fall 2005, Metro, again consulted with regional jurisdictions to identify the next priority corridor(s) for commencement of planning work. Based on the outcome of that consultation in Spring 2005, the Corridor Refinement Work Plan will be updated to reflect current and new efforts and responsibilities.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Project partners include ODOT, FHWA, TriMet and associated counties and cities
- Business dependent on the corridor including those directly within the corridor, those who utilize it for freight and those whose employees rely on the corridor to reach work
- Commuters who travel to or through the corridor for work, shopping or to reach leisure destinations
- Residents of the area and neighborhood associations within or adjacent to the corridor

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES

- Ensure consistency with regional plans and policies related to major transportation corridors by participating in local planning and project development activities, including technical advisory committees, workshops and charrettes as well as formal comment on proposed projects
- Implement the Corridor Initiatives Project strategy in the RTP through monitoring ongoing planning activities and working with other jurisdictions to initiate new corridor efforts
- Participate in the development of Columbia River Crossing Project
- Participate in ODOTs' Oregon Innovative Partnerships Program (OIPP), which is seeking private partners to help develop transportation facilities. In August they received proposals from private firms in response to a solicitation on the I-205 and several other facilities. Metro staff has been asked to participate in negotiations and scoping work this winter and spring. The work is on a fast track and of a high priority.
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE
(Most of these projects started under this program, but many evolved into independent studies)

• Corridor Initiatives Project prioritized the multi-modal corridors outlined in the 2000 RTP (2001)
• Corridor Refinement Work Plan adopted into RTP (2002)
• Highway 217 initial scoping and grant application (2002)
• Powell Foster Phase I initiated (2002)
• Powell Foster Phase II work completed (2003)
• Travel forecasting and FTA liaison for Washington County Commuter Rail project (2001-present)
• Participation in eastside streetcar and I-405 loop studies (2004-2005)
• Scoping and grant applications for I-5/99W project (2003-present)
• Participation in scoping, funding, travel analysis and advisory committees for Sunrise Corridor (2003-present)
• Update of Corridor Priorities Work Plan (2005)

BUDGET SUMMARY

Requirements:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>111,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>39,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>151,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resources:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Support</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5303</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet</td>
<td>17,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>151,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

| Regular Full-Time FTE | 1.05 |
| TOTAL                 | 1.05 |

Exhibit F
MODEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Model Enhancements

- Personal Transport Model: Continue the enhancement of the algorithms used to estimate travel decisions. Incorporate elements derived from the TRANSIMS demand model research into the Metro models.
- Regional Freight Model: Update the regional freight model using data collected during the Phase 2 Freight Data Collection effort. The origin – destination freight data is being collected during calendar year 2005.
- Statewide Travel Demand Model: Coordinate with the ODOT regarding integration of the statewide model (completed in FY 2004-05) and the more detailed Metro regional model. The statewide model will be useful in that it provides an indication of traffic (auto and truck) growth rates that may occur at the regional boundaries. In addition, it will provide indications as to how Metro land use policies may affect other Willamette Valley cities.
- New Modeling Software: Complete the transition to new travel demand modeling software. This process was begun in FY2004-05. The software will provide enhanced visual and analytical capabilities.

Model Maintenance

- Modeling Network Attributes: Review and update, as necessary, the modeling network assumptions (e.g., uncongested speeds, vehicle throughput capacities, transit line itineraries).

Statewide and National Professional Involvement

- Oregon Modeling Steering Committee (OMSC): Participate on the OMSC. Staff currently serves as the chair for this committee.
- Transportation Research Board (TRB) Committees: Serve on TRB committees that help shape national planning guidelines. Examples include the Transportation Planning Applications Committee, the Innovations in Freight Modeling Committee, and the Committee on Survey Methods.
- National Panels: Serve on national committees as warranted. Examples include the Travel Model Improvement Program Review Panel, the task force to assess the State of the Practice of Metropolitan Area Travel Forecasting, and the Panel on Assessing Transit System User Benefits. In addition, staff occasionally participates on peer review panels that help to assess the functionality of the travel demand models used in other regions.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

Survey and Research

- Travel Behavior Survey: Participated on a statewide committee to design and administer the pilot test for the Travel Behavior Survey.
- Freight Data Collection: Participated on a regional committee to advise and comment on the survey objectives and survey process.
- Oregon State University (OSU) TransNow Research Project: Served in an advisory role to an OSU study team assembled to assess the use of GPS technology in capturing truck origin and destination data.

Model Enhancements

- Personal Transport Model: Updated the travel demand models to align with the new employment designations (Bureau of Labor Statistics) adopted by the Data Resource Center. Refinements were also made to the algorithms in the destination choice and mode choice models.
MODEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

- New Modeling Software: Began the transition to new travel demand modeling software. This process was begun in FY 2004-05. The software will provide enhanced visual and analytical capabilities.

Model Maintenance

- Modeling Network Attributes: Reviewed and updated, as necessary, the modeling network assumptions (e.g., uncongested speeds, vehicle throughput capacities, transit line itineraries).
- Volume Delay Functions: Using data derived from the PSU Intelligent Transportation System laboratory, updated the functions used to estimate congested vehicle speeds given volume and capacity relationships.

Statewide and National Professional Involvement

- OMSC: Participated on the OMSC. Staff currently serves as the chair for this committee.
- TRB Committees: Served on TRB committees that help shape national planning guidelines. Examples include the Transportation Planning Applications Committee, the Innovations in Freight Modeling Committee, and the Committee on Survey Methods.
- National Panels: Served on national committees as warranted. Examples include the Travel Model Improvement Program Review Panel, the task force to assess the State of the Practice of Metropolitan Area Travel Forecasting, and the Panel on Assessing Transit System User Benefits. In addition, staff participated on peer review panels that help to assess the functionality of the travel demand models used in other regions (e.g., Anchorage model review).

BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>STP/ODOT Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>ODOT Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Survey</td>
<td>Section 5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>TriMet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$226,700 $70,379 $103,379 $15,000 $10,922 $234,417 $115,031 $4,000 $21,418 $2,851 $27,663 $411,380 $411,380

Full-Time Equivalent Staffing

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>2.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.269</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit G
PROGRAM

Metro will provide a variety of services to the Columbia River Crossing Project (CRC), led jointly by the Oregon and Washington Departments of Transportation. Federal, state and local funding will be passed through to Metro via an Intergovernmental Agreement that will cover an approximately 15 month period beginning November 1, 2005. Metro staff will participate in and coordinate activities relating to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) New Starts Program. Metro will coordinate CRC Project review and decision-making for the Portland region, including the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), and their Transportation Finance Subcommittee, and the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC).

Metro will provide technical services for land use allocation and travel demand forecasting for the project. The regional travel demand forecasting model set will be used by the project to provide forecasts for the Oregon and Washington sides of the project for the initial and secondary screening of alternatives and the DEIS. Metro will model all project alternatives and will coordinate data and methods with SW Washington’s Regional Transportation Council (RTC). For the FTA New Starts process, Metro will utilize SUMMIT software to assess transit system user benefits and will provide assistance in the development of other land use and transportation data for FTA. Metro will also coordinate review of land use forecasts, issues and assumptions by the Portland region’s Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) and serve as co-lead with the Southwest Washington RTC to coordinate Project reviews by the Bi-State Coordinating Committee.

Other areas where Metro will provide assistance include the development of project funding scenarios and coordination with the JPACT Finance subcommittee, evaluation of tolling and managed lane scenarios as well as congestion pricing as a demand management strategy. The project has several committees that include Metro staff representation. The committees include the Project Development Team, the Regional Partners Group, and various Technical Working Groups including Travel Demand Forecasting, Environmental, Design, and Transit as well as other groups that are formed around specific project technical issues.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

As provided by the State TPR, Metro is required to complete a regional Transportation System Plan, which identifies the need for transportation facilities and their function, mode and general location. The 2000 RTP calls for completion of 18 specific corridor refinements and studies for areas where significant needs were identified but which require further analysis before a specific project can be developed. Section 680-012-0025 of the TPR requires prompt completion of corridor refinements and studies. The Columbia Crossing River Project is the implementation of the recommendations forwarded by the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership, which evaluated the bi-state I-5 north corridor.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Project partners include ODOT, WSDOT, FHWA, FTA, TriMet, RTC, C-Tran, the cities of Vancouver and Portland and Clark County.
- Business dependent on the corridor including those directly within the corridor, those who utilize it for freight and those whose employees rely on the corridor to reach work.
- Commuters who travel to or through the corridor for work, shopping or to reach leisure destinations.
- Residents of the area and neighborhood associations within or adjacent to the corridor.
COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING PROJECT

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES

- Implement a multi-modal solution for bi-state mobility for the I-5 and I-205 river crossings.
- Implement the multi-modal transportation program in support of the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership including demand management strategies, managed lanes and tolling, and transit improvements.
- Ensure consistency of the CRC Project with regional plans and policies related to major transportation corridors and ensure that the CRC Project land use and transportation technical methods are consistent with current Metro practices.
- Ensure that the CRC Project competes favorably for FTA New Starts transit project funding.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

Some elements of this project have been completed as part of the start-up activities covered under the UPWP Project Development work program.

- I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Strategic Plan was completed in 2004
- Definition of the travel demand and land use allocation methodologies for the project
- Preparation of a work scope and budget for the Metro-WSDOT Intergovernmental Agreement
- Metro staff have supported the Task Force and Project Sponsors Council policy-level committees
- Metro staff sit on several project technical committees including the Project Development Team and the Travel Forecasting, Transit, Environmental, and Design Working Groups.
- Metro has participated in the development of the purpose and need and evaluation criteria.
- Metro staff have coordinated with the FTA regarding the New Starts and NEPA processes for the project.

BUDGET SUMMARY – FY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>WSDOT IGA</td>
<td>$409,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$409,468</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full-Time Equivalent Staffing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit H
REGIONAL FREIGHT PLAN

PROGRAM

This program manages the identification of the region's freight system, policies and project needs and includes them in RTP. It provides coordination with local, state and federal plans so that freight plans are consistent. It ensures that prioritized freight requests are competitively considered within federal, state and regional funding programs. It will also allow continued freight data collection, analysis, education and coordination within the region. Note that the level of effort identified is contingent upon receipt of continued MTIP funding.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

TEA-21 requires MPOs to meet seven planning factors including planning for people and freight and supporting economic vitality by enabling global competition, productivity and equity. In support of Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals 9 and 12, the Transportation Planning Rule requires TSPs to identify the "needs for movement of goods and services to support industrial and commercial development." Further, the 2040 growth concept identifies the importance of industrial activity to the region by establishing special industrial districts as a priority land use.

RTP Policy 15.0, Regional Freight System, requires Metro to "provide efficient, cost-effective and safe movement of freight in and through the region" by identifying freight needs and projects to resolve them. TPR 660-012-0020, Elements of TSPs, requires consistency between local, regional, state and federal functional classifications. The RTP Freight Policies 15.0 and 15.1 specifically direct Metro to work with local jurisdictions and state agencies to meet federal mandates for the intermodal and congestion management systems, to identify projects and to coordinate plans. RTP Policy 15.1, Regional Freight System Investments, specifically directs Metro to "protect and enhance public and private investments in the freight network" by seeking opportunities for public private partnerships and encouraging public funding of freight investments.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Metro Council, TPAC and JPACT
- Metro Planning (RTP)
- Cities and counties within the region
- ODOT, Port of Portland, FHWA
- Businesses, including freight shippers and carriers, distribution companies, manufacturers, retailers and commercial firms
- Oregon Trucking Association and other business associations including the Westside Economic Alliance, the Columbia Corridor Association, and the Portland Business Alliance
- Metro area residents and neighborhood associations

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES

- Working with the Port of Portland, complete the freight data collection study
- Update the regional truck model to incorporate origin and destination information from the Freight Data Collection Study
- With the trucking industry and other interests, lead a review of the street design guidelines to ensure that they accommodate freight needs
- Expand regional freight committee to include significant private sector representation and make it an official subcommittee of TPAC
- Continue to work with Oregon Freight Advisory Committee to identify statewide freight project needs and seek support for funding of priorities
- Participate in the Portland Freight Committee and the Portland Freight Master Plan project
- Track projects with significant implications for freight movement such as the I-5 Columbia Crossing, I-5 Delta Park and the Sunrise Corridor projects

Exhibit I
REGIONAL FREIGHT PLAN

• Participate in the Port of Portland led Oregon Rail Users League, which is identifying key rail priorities and advocating for funding with the State Legislature
• Provide information regarding freight needs in support of freight funding proposals being considered by the legislature ("Connect Oregon")
• Work with the Port of Portland and private interests to explore methods to increase private sector participation in rail funding
• Work with agencies and private interests to identify key multi-modal priorities, secure appropriate private matching funds and ensure that they are competitively considered under state freight funding programs

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

• Established regional freight network as part of 2000 RTP
• Established Freight Policies (15 and 15.1) as part of 2000 RTP
• Updated freight network as part of 2003 RTP
• Participated in Commodity Flow Study and Updates
• Developed regional truck model and incorporated updates to reflect new commodity forecasts
• Initiated Freight Data Collection Study
• Established and led the Regional Freight Committee, comprised of 13 local, regional and state agencies
• Developed the freight category and criteria for MTIP
• Led regional freight project prioritization effort (2003-04) as part of OTIA III, which resulted in the region obtaining significant funding for freight projects
• Participated in State and federal freight model development programs
• Member of Freight Data users Group
• Member of Portland and Oregon Freight Advisory Committees
• Active participant in local freight planning efforts such as the St. Johns Truck Study and the Sandy Boulevard study
• Provide leadership on Columbia Corridor Association and Westside Economic Alliance Transportation Committees
• Worked with ODOT on I-5 rail capacity analysis
• Participated in ORULE
• Received Travel & Growth Management Grant

BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$194,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>$64,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>$7,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$266,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit I
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

CITY OF PORTLAND – MLK Jr. Boulevard Turn Lanes: Columbia to Lombard

The MLK Columbia Transportation Improvement Plan will develop a package of improvements for that are in the vicinity of Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd from NE Columbia to NE Killingsworth Streets. The improvements could include:

- A grade separation of NE 11th Ave.
- Improvements to the intersections at NE Columbia and NE Killingsworth St.
- Roadway geometry improvements on NE Columbia NE Killingsworth St.
- Signal improvements
- Installation of new traffic signals
- Development of new public rights of way
- Storm water management associated with new construction

The improvements will be identified following a detailed analysis of the existing conditions and full assessment of the current future transportation needs in the corridor.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

This project is identified in the Transportation System Plan of the City of Portland, the Regional Transportation Plan and the Port of Portland Transportation Improvement Program. The project will be carried out and managed by the Project Management Division of the Portland Office of Transportation.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Portland Office of Transportation
- Portland Bureau of Environmental Services
- TriMet
- City of Portland Freight Advisory Committee
- The Port of Portland
- Union Pacific/Southern Pacific Railroad
- Oregon Department of Transportation
- Columbia Corridor Association

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES

Problem Definition and Project Identification

- Prepare existing and future conditions report using field observation, transportation modeling, traffic analysis and stakeholder surveys.
- Using existing and future conditions analysis develop a comprehensive prioritized list of potential transportation issues.
- Wide range of possible solutions to identified transportation issues.
- Alternatives Development and Analysis
- Using agreed upon criteria screen the wide range of alternatives to a narrower range of alternatives.
- Conduct fatal flaw level analysis on the wide range of alternatives.
- Select a narrow range of Alternatives to advance to Alternatives Analysis and determine the appropriate process to meet the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act.
- Identify a series of operational and maintenance improvements to be implemented in the short-term using existing agency resources.
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Project Development

• Begin Preliminary Engineering on alternatives identified above. (This task will be dependent on adequate financing and complexity of the selected alternative.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

This is a new program intended to implement the recommendations of the Columbia Corridor Transportation Study in 1999.

BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services (PDOT)</td>
<td>Regional STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$204,450</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>PDOT match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$54,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$554,450</td>
<td>$554,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit J
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

CITY OF PORTLAND – St Johns Pedestrian and Freight Project (IVANHOE: RICHMOND-ST LOUIS)

The St Johns Freight and Pedestrian consists of two related projects in the St Johns Town Center. The freight project implements the recommendations of the St Johns Truck Strategy and the pedestrian project implements the recommendations of the St Johns/Lombard Plan. The planning phase that will refine the proposed improvements of both plans prior to design engineering.

Phase I of the St Johns Truck Strategy includes signal and geometry improvements to the N Philadelphia/N Ivanhoe, Ivanhoe/St Louis and St Louis/Lombard intersections to improve freight mobility between the St Johns Bridge, Rivergate Industrial area and Columbia Blvd freight route. The project will also include improvements designed reduce conflicts with pedestrian circulation within the town center core area and discourage use of non-designated freight routes. The planning work will refine the basic design concept proposed in the St Johns Truck Strategy to address design issues associated with truck speeds, right-of-way acquisition and access to the town center for other modes.

Planning for the pedestrian improvements will focus on design refinement of the curb extensions recommendations of the St Johns Lombard Plan to improve pedestrian crossing safety. Key refinement issues include design and warrants of a proposed signal at N Richmond St and Ivanhoe St and the location, transit capability, and potential impacts to traffic capacity and on-street parking supply of the proposed curb extensions.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

Both projects are identified in the Transportation System Plan of the City of Portland and the Regional Transportation Plan. The projects will be carried out and managed by the Project Management Division of the Portland Office of Transportation.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Portland Office of Transportation
- Portland Bureau of Environmental Services
- Portland Bureau of Planning
- Tri-Met
- Oregon Department of Transportation
- Oregon Trucking Association
- North Portland Business Association
- St Johns Boosters Business Association
- St Johns Neighborhood Association
- Cathedral Park Business Association

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES

Project Scoping
- Develop project work plan and assemble work team.
- Refine design concept for freight related improvements to determine basic intersection geometry, incorporate measures to control freight speeds, enhance pedestrian crossing safety, and minimize impacts to local access and circulation for non-freight traffic.
- Revisit location priorities for pedestrian crossing improvements and design options at chosen locations to address the design guidelines included in the St Johns/Lombard Plan.

Plan Implementation
- Provide refined design concepts for preliminary engineering phase with cost estimates.

Public Outreach and Involvement
- Develop public involvement strategy consistent with conditions outlined in the MTIP.
ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

Both the freight and pedestrian projects are intended to support St Johns' town center designation. The Portland Office of Transportation identified the projects in its Transportation System Plan and are the outgrowth of the St Johns Truck Strategy, adopted by City Council in 2001 and the St Johns/Lombard Plan, adopted by City Council in 2004.

BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services (PDOT)</td>
<td>Regional STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>PDOT match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,840</td>
<td>$7,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$82,840</strong></td>
<td><strong>$82,840</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

CITY OF WEST LINN – Highway 43 Boulevard: West A Street to McKillican

Complete a streetscape plan for Highway 43 between West A Street and McKillican Street in West Linn. The streetscape plan will develop implement regional street design guidelines and address substandard pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities and the potential addition of a median/turn lane.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

This project is identified in the Transportation System Plan of the City of West Linn and the Regional Transportation Plan. The project will be carried out and managed by the City of West Linn.

STAKEHOLDERS

• City of West Linn
• Oregon Department of Transportation
• TriMet
• Bolton Middle School
• Bolton Neighborhood

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/Deliverables

• Planning background report summarizing planning activities, project need statement and project solution statement.
• Base map, profiles, typical sections and narrative describing field location data.
• Report describing anticipated structure and foundation needs.
• Description of future maintenance needs and the responsible agencies.
• Cost estimates for future project phases (final design/engineering, right-of-way, construction).
• Map of properties in the project area; ROW report including title information.
• Environmental Baseline Report to address federal environmental requirements.
• Initial draft of ODOT Prospectus Part 3 narrative and checklist.
• A public outreach summary report.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

Project development planning for this project is first step leading to proposal for future work on final design, right of way acquisition and construction.

BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>Regional STP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>West Linn match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requirements: $220,900
Resources: $200,000
OTHER PROJECTS OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

METRO – Tonquin Trail Master Plan

This project will plan multi-use trail improvements between the cities of Wilsonville, Tualatin and Sherwood.

MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS

This project is identified in the Transportation System Plan of the Cities of Wilsonville, Tualatin and Sherwood and the Regional Transportation Plan. The project will be carried out and managed by Metro.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Metro
- City of Wilsonville
- City of Tualatin
- City of Sherwood
- Clackamas County
- Washington County
- Costa Pacific Communities

OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DELIVERABLES

The master plan would complete planning work to determine a more precise route for the trail along BPA power line corridors and the ODOT owned rail line and other public right of ways. Trail widths, surface materials, and signage, street-crossing designs would be proposed and associated costs estimated. In developing these alignment and design recommendations, Metro’s guidelines for Green Trails will be employed.

A public outreach strategy will be developed and employed to engage stakeholders and the community in alignment and design decisions.

- Planning background report summarizing planning activities, project need statement and project solution statement.
- Base map, profiles, typical sections and narrative describing field location data.
- Reconnaissance level report of flow and drainage conditions; regulatory requirements to be addressed and preliminary drainage and water quality options.
- Report describing anticipated structure and foundation needs.
- Description of future maintenance needs and the responsible agencies.
- Cost estimates for future project phases (final design/engineering, right-of-way, construction).
- Map of properties in the project area; ROW report including title information.
- Environmental Baseline Report to address federal environmental requirements.
- Initial draft of ODOT Prospectus Part 3 narrative and checklist.
- A public outreach summary report.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

A trail feasibility study was completed in July 2004 and identified potential trail routes and alignments. Metro and the City of Wilsonville has worked with Costa Pacific homes to determine the dedication of a trail alignment through the Villebois property and to design the trail segment through the Graham Oaks natural area. The Boeckman Road extension project has provided for the trail crossing of a wetland as a part of that project. The cities of Wilsonville, Tualatin and Sherwood have updated their trails and park plans to allow for the future Tonquin Trail.
### BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services (Metro)</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>Regional STP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>$37,650</td>
<td>Metro match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$207,650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit J
**REGIONAL TRAVEL OPTIONS**

**PROGRAM**

The RTO program is the region’s TDM strategy for reducing reliance on the automobile. The program has been funded for nearly 20 years, and has grown to include a variety of regional partners and outreach programs proven to reduce travel demand and encourage alternatives to driving alone. Since the early 1990s, the program has provided a daily reduction of 10,700 auto trips and daily VMT reduction of 79,400 miles, or the equivalent capacity to 10 highway lane miles. The program is also central to the region’s efforts to maintain “attainment” status with federal air quality requirements. The program’s effectiveness in meeting these goals is monitored on an ongoing basis through a system of detailed evaluations of individual components and employer surveys, and is documented in annual reports published by Metro.

The Metro Council approved a new strategic plan for the RTO program in 2004, shifting the lead role for managing the program from TriMet to Metro. The updated program places a major emphasis on individual marketing, and will be augmented by a recently funded state TDM program. Most of the RTO program activities are carried out by public agency partners or consultant contracts, administered by Metro. The key components of the RTO program are:

- Marketing Program
- Rideshare - Vanpool Program
- Transportation Management Association Program
- Grant Program
- Annual Program Evaluation

**MANDATES, AUTHORIZATIONS, CONSTRAINTS**

The 2003 RTO Strategic Plan was approved by Metro Council resolution, and provides the framework for RTO policy development activities. The RTO Subcommittee of TPAC serves as the technical committee for RTO policy development.

The RTO program is an economic development tool for regional centers and industrial areas. RTO strategies support economic growth in centers by freeing up land currently used for parking for jobs and housing. The program increases the capacity of current transportation infrastructure by providing and promoting alternatives to driving alone – carpooling, vanpooling, riding transit, bicycling, walking and telecommuting.

The RTO program works directly with employers to find the best travel options for their employees through TriMet’s Employer Outreach Program and local transportation management associations (TMAs). Services provided through the RTO program, such as carpool matching, vanpools and transit pass program ensure access to jobs for low-income residents of the region.

**STAKEHOLDERS**

- Metro Council
- RTO Service Providers (a regional consortium that includes Metro, TriMet and others)
- RTO Subcommittee and TPAC
- JPACT

**OBJECTIVES/PRODUCTS/DelIVERABLES**

- Continued implementation of the RTO Strategic Plan and Phase I transition
- Continued policy development and evaluation in partnership with RTO Subcommittee
- Completion of 2005 Annual Report
REGIONAL TRAVEL OPTIONS

- Development and implementation of a marketing campaign to raise public awareness of travel options and encourage people to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips. The campaign will include television, radio and outdoor advertising, earned media and community outreach.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THIS PROGRAM TO DATE

- Completion of 2002 RTO Annual Report
- Completion of 2003 RTO Strategic Plan
- Completion of 2003 RTO Annual Report

BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements:</th>
<th>Resources:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Transfers</td>
<td>ODOT Transit*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td>Resources:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$292,132</td>
<td>$789,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$89,118</td>
<td>$1,038,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,485,722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,864,972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Marketing Agreement No. 22211
CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 06-3651 FOR THE
PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE FY 2006 UNIFIED PLANNING
WORK PROGRAM

Date: November 28, 2005

Presented by: Andrew C. Cotugno

PROPOSED ACTION

This resolution would to approve an amendment to the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to 1) approve additional activities in transportation planning programs and to incorporate an increase of $438,380 in the PL funding by contract for FY 2006; 2) approve the addition of the Columbia River Crossing project of $409,468 and authorizes execution of a resulting IGA; 3) adds $75,000 for a TGM grant to fund consultant support for the Freight Study program; 4) includes new local government transportation planning projects for which Metro now has an administrative oversight role; and 5) for the Regional Travel Options program approve an amendment of $586,600 to ODOT Marketing agreement and to account for increase in Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ) funds of $433,372.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The FY 2006 UPWP Amendment includes increases in transportation planning activities to be carried out in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region fiscal year 2006. Those additional activities included:

- **Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**- RTP will be expanded to incorporate new corrective actions and recommendations identified in the federal 2004 triennial review and to implement “New Look” policies resulting from upcoming evaluation of the 2040 Growth Concept. In addition, this budget reflects a shift of $150,000 from the 2040 reevaluation to the RTP update as approved by resolution no. 05-3610A “For the Purpose of Issuing a Request for Proposals to Develop a Work Scope for an Expanded 2005-08 Regional Transportation Plan Update that Incorporates the “Budgeting for Outcomes” Approach to Establish Regional Priorities” which was adopted on September 22, 2005. The request for proposal will fund consultant support in developing the financially constrained RTP. *Increases Budget - $249,000.*

- **Regional Mobility Program-Congestion Management-ITS**- Work will be expanded to included CMS as required as part of the 2003 federal certification review, increase Metro’s involvement with the TransPort Committee, establish a CMS steering group, conduct local CMS training, integrate CMS data collection with 2040 Performance Indicators, and continue to develop new innovations in congestion monitoring. *Increases Budget - $20,000.*

- **Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)**- Metro will begin a new role of guiding project development for planning activities funded through the MTIP at the request of Oregon Department of Transportation which will involve expanding Metro’s professional capabilities to include a licensed engineer. MTIP will also begin developing a new database that will enhance our ability to extract project data and conduct regular updates. *Increases Budget - $100,000.*

- **Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)**- Adds development work on CMS roadmap and continued participation in MPO coordination activities through the Oregon MPO Consortium and
in quarterly MPO technical meetings. At ODOT's request Metro will also play a larger administrative role in regional planning project where the local is the lead agency, FHWA is the grantor and ODOT is the pass-through. Metro will take part in negotiating scope, schedule and budget with the locals and perform general contract administration. ODOT will continue to be the pass-thru agency, initiate 3-party IGA's and assist the local jurisdictions with their sub consultant procurement. 

- **Project Development**— Adds Metro’s participation in Oregon Innovated Partnership Program (dealing with private/public highway projects) and accounts for Metro’s development work on Columbia River Crossing Project prior to the effective date of the IGA with Washington State Department of Transportation. 

  *Increases Budget* -$100,000

- **Model Development**— Because Metro received additional PL we able to additional funding for Household Survey. 

  *Increases Budget* - $88,380

- **HWY 217 Corridor Study**— Due to the delay in concluding the HWY 217 study and the associated delay in starting the Next Corridor study, $147,000 is transferred from one budget to the other. 

The amendment also includes the following projects to Metro’s corridor planning role:

- **Columbia River Crossing Project**— A joint project with Oregon and Washington Departments of Transportation to implement the recommendations forwarded by the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership. Metro will provide technical services for land use allocation and travel demand forecasting. This project is funded through the Washington State Department of Transportation. 

  *Budget-$409,468.*

- **Freight Study**— Metro received $150,000 Travel & Growth Management grant to complete a regional freight study. $75,000 is expected to be spent this fiscal year. 

  *Increases Budget* - $75,000

At ODOT’s request Metro will have an administrative role in the planning projects that receive regional flexible funds, where a local is the lead agency, FHWA is the grantor and ODOT is the pass-through agency. Metro is required to include all federally funded planning projects in the MTIP and UPWP. The following regional projects have been approved in the MTIP and need to be included in the UPWP by amendment:

- **City of Portland- MLK Jr. Boulevard Turn Lanes: Columbia to Lombard**— This project will evaluate and develop a designs to improve truck movements between Columbia Boulevard and Lombard in the vicinity of NE Martin Luther King Boulevard. The project will be carried out and managed by the Project Management Division of the Portland Office of Transportation. 

  *Budget- $552,000.*

- **City of Portland- St Johns Pedestrian and Freight Project**— This project will develop project design elements for pedestrian safety and truck movements in the St. Johns neighborhood of Portland. The project will be carried out and managed by the Project Management Division of the Portland Office of Transportation. 

  *Budget- $82,838.*

- **City of West Linn- Highway 43 Boulevard: West A Street to McKillican**— This project will plan multi-modal improvements to Highway 43 through West Linn. 

  *Budget- $220,900.*

- **Metro- Tonquin Trail Master Plan**— This project will plan multi-use trail improvements between the cities of Wilsonville, Tualatin and Sherwood. 

  *Budget- $207,650.*

Additionally the amendment includes the following changes to the Regional Travel Options program:

- **Regional Travel Options**— ODOT is initiating an amendment to Metro’s marketing agreement for Metro to subcontract a marketing campaign to raise public awareness of travel options. The campaign will include television, radio, and outdoor advertising, earned media and community outreach. Also Metro applied for an increase in CMAQ funds to account for the transition of the
management Travel Management Association (TMA) contracts from TriMet to Metro. Increases
Budget- $1,019,972.

BUDGET IMPACT

Increased revenue will match increased expenses. A budget amendment to Metro’s annual budget will be forth coming.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bernard</td>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Schilling</td>
<td>Multnomah County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Finn (Finn)</td>
<td>Port of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLIVIA CLARK</td>
<td>TM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Smith</td>
<td>Schnitzer Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATHRYN HARRINGTON</td>
<td>CITIZEN WAT CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Bobek</td>
<td>City of Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Bush</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Liu</td>
<td>City of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ram Pappard</td>
<td>City of Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Bisse</td>
<td>Wash Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Makgravf</td>
<td>CRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Asher</td>
<td>Milwaukie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeky Blizzard</td>
<td>Org. Blumauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Stiggeald</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Wasset</td>
<td>ETA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Becker</td>
<td>City of Altern-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Kemball</td>
<td>otsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer Dalin</td>
<td>City of Cornelias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Walker</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Tucker</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>